

A N
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANTIENT AND MODERN,
FROM
THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,
TO THE
BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:

IN WHICH
The Rise, Progress, and Variations of CHURCH POWER
ARE CONSIDERED

In their Connexion with the State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY,
and the POLITICAL HISTORY of EUROPE during that Period.

By the late learned

JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D.D.
And Chancellor of the University of GOTTINGEN.

Translated from the ORIGINAL,
And accompanied with NOTES and CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES,
By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, M.A.
Minister of the ENGLISH CHURCH at the HAGUE.

To the whole is added AN ACCURATE INDEX.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

V O L. II.

D U B L I N:
PRINTED FOR ANN LEATHLEY IN DAME-STREET.
MDCCLXVII.



A
COMPENDIOUS VIEW

OF

Ecclesiastical History.

BOOK THE THIRD.

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY of the CHURCH,

FROM

CHARLEMAGNE

TO

THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.

A 2

THE

A
COMPREHENSIVE VIEW

OF THE

BOOK THE THIRD

OF THE



HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

FROM

CHARLES THE FIRST

TO

THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER

THE

THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous events which happened to the church during this century.

I. **W**HILE the Mahometans were infesting with their arms, and adding to their conquests the most flourishing provinces of *Asia*, and obscuring, as far as their influence could extend, the lustre and glory of the rising church, the Nestorians of *Chaldaea* were carrying the lamp of Christianity among those barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, who, independant on the Saracen yoke, had fixed their habitations within the limits of mount *Imaus* [a]. It is now well known, that TIMOTHEUS, the Nestorian pontiff, who had been raised to that dignity A. D. 778, converted to the Christian faith, by the ministry of SUBCHAL JESU, whom he had consecrated bishop, first the Gelæ and

C E N T.
VIII.

The gospel
propagated
in *Hyrcania*
and *Tartary*.

[(a) The southern regions of *Scythia* were divided by the ancients (to whom the northern were unknown) into three parts, namely, *Scythia within*, and *Scythia beyond Imaus*, and *Sarmatia*. It is of the first of these three that Dr. MOSHEIM speaks as enlightened at this time with the knowledge of the gospel, and it comprehended *Turkestan* and *Mongal*; the *Usbek* or *Zagatai*, *Kalmuc* and *Nogatan Tartary*, which were peopled by the *Bactrians*, *Sogdians*, *Gandari*, *Sacs*, and *Massagetes*, not to mention the land of *Siberia*, *Samoiedes*, and *Nova Zembla*, which were uninhabited in ancient times.]

CENT.
V II.

Dailamites, by whom a part of *Hyrkania* was inhabited; and afterwards, by the labours of other missionaries, the rest of the nations, who had formed settlements in *Hyrkania*, *Bactria*, *Margiana*, and *Sogdia* [b]. It is also certain, that Christianity enjoyed in these vast regions, notwithstanding the violent attacks of the Mahometans to which it was sometimes exposed, the advantages of a firm and solid establishment for a long course of ages; while the bishops, by whose ministry it was propagated and supported, were all consecrated by the sole authority of the Nestorian pontiff.

The German converted by Boniface.

II. If we turn our eyes towards Europe, we find many nations that were as yet unenlightened with the knowledge of the gospel. Almost all the Germans (if we except the Bavarians, who had embraced Christianity under THEODORIC, or THIERRY, the son of CLOVIS, and the eastern Franks, with a few other provinces) lay buried in the grossest darkness of Pagan superstition. Many attempts were made, by pious and holy men, to infuse the truth into the minds of these savage Germans; and various efforts were used for the same purpose by kings and princes, whose interest it was to propagate a religion that was so adapted to mitigate and tame the ferocity of these war-like nations; but neither the attempts of pious zeal, nor the efforts of policy, were attended with success. This great work was, however, effected in this century, by the ministry of WINFRID, a Benedictine monk, born in *England* of illustrious parents, and afterwards known by the name of BONIFACE. This famous ecclesiastic, attended by two companions of his pious labours, passed over into *Friesland*, A. D. 715, to preach the gospel to the people of that country, but this first attempt was unsuccessful; and a war breaking out between RADBOD, the king of that country, and CHARLES MARTEL, our zealous missionary returned to *England*. He resumed,

[b] THOMAS MARGENSIS, *Historiæ Monasticæ* lib. iii. in JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Bibliotheca Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part I. p. 491. See also this latter work, tom. iii. part. II. cap. ix. § 5. p. 478.

how.



however, his pious undertaking in the year 719; and CENT.
VIII. being solemnly impowered, by the Roman pontiff GREGORY II, to preach the gospel not only in *Friesland*, but all over *Germany*, he performed the functions of a Christian teacher among the Thuringians, Frieslanders, and Hessians with considerable success [c].

III. This eminent missionary was, in the year 723, consecrated bishop by GREGORY II, who changed the name of WINFRID into that of BONIFACE; seconded also by the powerful protection, and encouraged by the liberality of CHARLES MARTEL, mayor of the palace to CHILPERIC king of *France*, he resumed his ministerial labours among the Hessians and Thuringians, and finished, with glory, the task he had undertaken, in which he received considerable assistance from a number of pious and learned men, who repaired to him from *England* and *France*. As the christian churches erected by BONIFACE were too numerous to be governed by one bishop this prelate was advanced to the dignity of archbishop, in the year 738, by GREGORY III, by whose authority, and the auspicious protection of CARLOMAN and PEPIN, the sons of CHARLES MARTEL, he founded in *Germany*, the bishopricks of *Wurtzbourg*, *Burabourg*, *Erfurt*, and *Aichstadt*: to which he added, in the year 744, the famous monastery of *Fulda*. His last promotion, and the last recompence of his assiduous labours in the propagation of the truth, was his advancement to the archiepiscopal see of *Mentz* A. D. 746, by ZACHARY, bishop of *Rome*, by whom he was, at the same time, created primate of *Germany* and *Belgium*. In his old age, he returned again to *Friesland*, that he might finish his ministry in the same place where he had entered first upon its functions: but his piety was ill rewarded by that barbarous people, by whom he was murdered in the year 755, while fifty ecclesi-

Other pious exploits of this famous missionary, and his advancement in the church.

[c] An ample account of this eminent man is to be found in a learned dissertation of GUDENIUS, *De S. Bonifacio Germanorum Apostolo*, published in 4to at *Helmstad* in the year 1722. See also Jo. AL. FARRICI *Biblioth. Latina mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 709. *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 92. MABILLON, in *Annalibus Benedictinis*, &c.

C E N T. astics, who accompanied him in this voyage, shared the
VIII. same unhapy fate.

The judg-
ment we are
to form con-
cerning the
apostleship of
Boniface.

IV. BONIFACE, on account of his ministerial labours and holy exploits, was distinguished by the honourable title of the *Apostle of the Germans*; nor, if we consider impartially the eminent services he rendered to Christianity, will this title appear to have been undeservedly bestowed. But it is necessary to observe, that this eminent prelate was an apostle of modern fashion, and had, in many respects, departed from the excellent model exhibited in the conduct and ministry of the primitive and true apostles. Besides his zeal for the glory and authority of the Roman pontiff, which equalled, if it did not surpass his zeal for the service of CHRIST, and the propagation of his religion [d], many other things unworthy of a truly Christian minister are laid to his charge. In combating the Pagan superstitions, he did not always use those arms, with which the ancient heralds of the gospel gained such victories in behalf of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and sometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Christians. His *epistles*, moreover, discover an imperious and arrogant temper; a cunning and insidious turn of mind; an excessive zeal for increasing the honours and pretensions of the sacerdotal order; and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was absolutely necessary in an apostle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Christian religion.

Other apos-
tles preach
the gospel to
the Ger-
mans.

V. The famous prelate, of whom we have been now speaking, was not the only Christian minister, who attempted to deliver the *German* nations from the miserable bondage of Pagan superstition; several others signalized their zeal in the same laudable and pious underta-

[d] The French Benedictine monks ingenuously confess that BONIFACE was an over zealous partisan of the Roman pontiff, and attributed more authority to him than was just and fitting. Their words, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 106. are as follows: " Il ex-
" prime son devouement pour le S. Siege en des termes qui ne sont pas
assez proportionnés à la dignité du Caractere episcopal."

king.

ing. CORBINIAN, a French Benedictine monk, after-
 having laboured with vast assiduity and fervour in plant-
 ing the gospel among the Bavarians, and other coun-
 tries, became bishop of *Freisingen* [e]. FIRMIN, a Gaul
 by birth, preached the gospel under various kinds of
 suffering and opposition in *Alsatia*, *Bavaria*, and *Hel-*
vetia, now *Switzerland*, and had inspection over a con-
 siderable number of monasteries [f]. LEBUIN, an
 Englishman, laboured with the most ardent zeal and
 assiduity to engage the fierce and warlike Saxons; and
 also the Frieslanders, Belgæ, and other nations to receive
 the light of Christianity, but his ministry was attended
 with very little fruit [g]. We pass over in silence several
 apostles of less fame; nor is it necessary to mention
 WILLIBORD, and others of superior reputation, who
 persisted now with great alacrity and constancy in the
 labours they had undertaken, in the preceding century,
 in order to the propagation of divine truth.

VI. A war broke out, at this time, between CHAR-
 LEMAGNE and the Saxons, which contributed much to
 the propagation of Christianity, though not by the
 force of a rational persuasion. The Saxons were, at this
 time, a numerous and formidable people; who inhabited
 a considerable part of *Germany*, and were engaged in
 perpetual quarrels with the Franks concerning their
 boundaries, and other matters of complaint. Hence
 CHARLEMAGNE turned his arms against this powerful
 nation, A. D. 772, with a design, not only to subdue
 that spirit of revolt, with which they had so often trou-
 bled the empire, but also to abolish their idolatrous
 worship, and engage them to embrace the Christian re-
 ligion. He hoped, by their conversion, to vanquish

The expedi-
 tion of Char-
 lemagne
 against the
 Saxons.

[e] BARONIUS, *Annal. Eccles.* tom. viii. ad An. DCCXVI. § 10.
 CAR. MAICHELBECK, *Historia Frisingensis* tom. i.

[f] HERM. BRUSCHII *Chronologia Monaster. German.* p. 30.
 ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Annales Baronii*, tom. ii. ad An. DCCLIX. § 9.
Histoire Litteraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 124.

[g] HUCBALDI *Vita S. LEBUINI* in LAUR. SURII *Vitis Sanctor.*
 p. 12. Nov. p. 277. JO. MOLLEII *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p.
 164.

their

CENT.
VIII.

their obstinacy, imagining that the divine precepts of the gospel would assuage their impetuous and restless passions, mitigate their ferocity, and induce them to submit more tamely to the government of the Franks. These projects were great in idea, but difficult in execution; accordingly, the first attempt to convert the Saxons, after having subdued them, was unsuccessful, because it was made, without the aid of violence or threats, by the bishops and monks, whom the victors had left among that conquered people, whose obstinate attachment to idolatry no arguments nor exhortations could overcome. More forcible means were afterwards used to draw them into the pale of the church, in the wars which CHARLEMAGNE carried on, in the years 775, 776, and 780, against that valiant people, whose love of liberty was excessive, and whose aversion to the restraints of sacerdotal authority was inexpressible [b]. During these wars, their attachment to the superstitions of their ancestors was so warmly combated by the allurements of reward, by the terror of punishment, and by the imperious language of victory, that they suffered themselves to be baptized, though with inward reluctance, by the missionaries, which the emperor sent

[b] It will be proper here to transcribe, from the epistles of the famous ALCUIN, once abbot of *Canterbury*, a remarkable passage, which will shew us the reasons which contributed principally to give the Saxons an aversion to Christianity, and, at the same time, expose the absurd and preposterous manner of teaching used by the missionaries, who were sent to convert them. This passage, in the *civ epistle*, and the 1647th page of his works, is as follows: "Si tanta instantia leve CHRISTI jugum et onus ejus leve durissimo Saxonum populo prædicaretur, quanta Decimarum redditu vel legalis pro parvissimis quibuslibet culpis edictis necessitas exigebatur, forte baptismatis sacramenta non abhorrent. Sint tandem aliquando DOCTORES FIDEI APOSTOLICIS ERUDITI EXEMPLIS; sint PRÆDICATORES non PRÆDATORES." Here the reader may see a lively picture of the kind of apostles that flourished at this time; apostles who were more zealous in exacting tithes, and extending their authority, than in propagating the sublime truths, and precepts of the gospel. And yet these very apostles are said to have wrought stupendous miracles.

among

among them for that purpose [i]. These seditions, indeed, CENT.
VIII. were soon after renewed, and fomented by WIDEKIND and ALBION, two of the most valiant among the Saxons chiefs, who attempted to abolish the Christian worship by the same violent methods which had contributed to its establishment. But the courage and liberality of CHARLEMAGNE, alternately employed to suppress this new rebellion, engaged these chiefs to make a public and solemn profession of Christianity, in the year 785, and to promise an adherence to that divine religion for the rest of their days [k]. To prevent, however, the Saxons from renouncing a religion, which they had embraced with reluctance, several bishops were appointed to reside among them, schools also were erected, and monasteries founded, that the means of instruction might not be wanting. The same precautions were em-

[i] ALCUINUS apud WILHELMUM MALMESBUR. *De gestis rerum Anglorum*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 23. inter *Rerum Anglicar. Scriptores, Francofurti* A. D. 1601. editos. In this work we find the following passage, which proves what we have said with respect to the unworthy methods that were used in converting the Saxons: "Antiqui Saxones et omnes Fresonum populi, instante Rege CAROLO, alios PRÆMIIS et alios MINIS sollicitantes ad fidem CHRISTI conversi sunt." See also two passages in the *Capitularia Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 246 and 252. From the first of these passages we learn that those of the Saxons, who abandoned the Pagan superstitions, were "restored to the liberty they had forfeited by the fate of arms, and freed from the obligation of paying tribute;" and in the second, we find the following severe law, that "every Saxon, who contemptuously refused to receive the sacrament of baptism, and persisted in his adherence to Paganism, was to be punished with death." While such rewards and punishments were employed in the cause of religion, there was no occasion for miracles to advance its progress, for these motives were sufficient to draw all mankind to an hypocritical and external profession of the gospel; but it is easy to imagine what sort of Christians the Saxons must have been, who were dragooned into the church in this abominable manner. Compare with the authors mentioned in this note, LAUNOIUS, *De veteri more baptizandi Judæos et Infideles*, cap. v. vi. p. 703. tom. ii. Opp. part. II. This author assures us, that ADRIAN, the first Roman pontiff of that name, honoured with his approbation CHARLEMAGNE's method of converting the Saxons.

[k] EGINARTUS, *De vita Caroli M.* ADAM BREMENSIS, lib. i. cap. viii. See also the writers of the history and exploits of CHARLEMAGNE, which are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Latina mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 259.

ployed

CENT.
VIII.

The judgment we ought to form of the conversions made by Charlemagne.

ployed among the Huns in *Pannonia*, to maintain in the profession of Christianity that fierce people, who, hausted and dejected by various defeats, they were no longer able to make head against his victorious arms, and chose rather to be *Christians* than *slaves* [l].

VII. Succeeding generations, filled with a grateful sense of the famous exploits which CHARLEMAGNE had performed in the service of Christianity, canonised him in memory, and turned this bloody *warrior* into an eminent *saint*. In the twelfth century, FREDERIC I, emperor of the Romans, ordered PASCHAL II. whom he had raised to the pontificate, to enroll the name of this mighty conqueror among the tutelary saints of the church [m]. And, indeed, CHARLEMAGNE merited this honour according to the opinions which generally prevailed at that period of time; for to have enriched the clergy with large and magnificent donations [n] and to have extended the boundaries of the church, no matter by what methods, was then considered as the highest merit, and as a sufficient pretension to the honour of *sainthood*. But in the esteem of those, who judge of the nature and characters of *sanctity* by the decisions of the gospel upon that head, the *sainted* emperor will appear utterly unworthy of that ghostly dignity. For not to enter into a particular detail of his vices, whose number counterbalanced that of his virtues, it is undeniably evident, that his ardent and ill-conducted zeal for the conversion of the Huns, Frielanders, and Saxons, was more animated by the suggestions of ambition, than by a principle of true piety; and that his main view in these religious exploits was to subdue the converted nations under his dominion, and to tame them

[l] *Vita S. Rudberti* in HENRIC. CANISII *Lectionibus Antiquis*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 340. PAULI DEBRECENI *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformat. Hungar. et Transilvania* a LAMPPIO edita, part. I. cap. ii. p. 10.

[m] VID. HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 207. WALCHII *Dissert. de Caroli Magni Canonizatione*.

[n] VID. CAROLI *Testamentum* in STEPH. BALUZII *Capitularibus Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 487.

to his yoke which they supported with impatience, and shook off by frequent revolts. It is, moreover, well known, that this boasted saint made no scruple of seeking the alliance of the infidel Saracens, that he might be more effectually enabled to crush the Greeks, notwithstanding their profession of the Christian religion [o].

VIII. The many and stupendous miracles, which are said to have been wrought by the Christian missionaries, who were sent to convert the barbarous nations, have lost, in our times, the credit they obtained in former ages. The corrupt discipline that then prevailed admitted of those fallacious stratagems, which are very improperly called *pious* frauds; nor did the heralds of the gospel think it at all unlawful to terrify or allure to the profession of Christianity, by fictitious prodigies, those obdurate hearts, which they could not subdue by reason and argument. It is not, however, to be supposed, that all those, who acquired renown by their miracles, were chargeable with this fanatical species of artifice and fraud. For as, on the one hand, those ignorant and superstitious nations were disposed to look upon, as miraculous, every event, which had an unusual aspect; so, on the other, the Christian doctors themselves were so uninstructed and superficial, so little acquainted with the powers of nature, and the relations and connexions of things in their ordinary course, that uncommon events, however natural, were considered by them as miraculous interpositions of the most high. This will appear obvious to such as, void of superstition and partiality, read the *Acts of the saints*, who flourished in this and the following centuries.

And of the miracles which are said to have been performed in this century.

[o] See BASNAGE, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. ix. cap. ii. p. 40.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events, which happened to the church during this century.

The Saracens become masters in the east.

I. **T**HE eastern empire had now fallen from its former strength and grandeur, through the repeated shocks of dreadful revolutions, and the consuming power of intestine calamities. The throne was now become the seat of terror, inquietude, and suspicion; nor was any reign attended with an uninterrupted tranquillity. In this century three emperors were dethroned, loaded with ignominy, and sent into banishment. Under **LEO**; the Isaurian, and his son **CONSTANTINE**, surnamed **COPRONYMUS**, arose that fatal controversy about the worship of images; which proved a source of innumerable calamities and troubles, and weakened, almost incredibly, the force of the empire. These troubles and dissensions left the Saracens at liberty to ravage the provinces of *Asia* and *Africa*, to oppress the Greeks in the most barbarous manner, and to extend their territories and dominion on all sides; as also to oppose every where the progress of Christianity, and, in some places, to extirpate it entirely. But the troubles of the empire, and the calamities of the church, did not end here: for about the middle of this century, they were assailed by new enemies, still more fierce and inhuman than those whose usurpations they had hitherto suffered. These were the **Turks**, a tribe of the **Tartars**, or at least, their descendants, who breaking forth from the inaccessible wilds about mount *Caucasus*, overspread *Colchis*, *Iberia*, and *Albania*, rushed from thence into *Armenia*; and, after having subdued the Saracens, turned their victorious arms against the Greeks, whom, in process of time, they reduced under their dominion.

The invasion of the Turks.

Their progress in the west.

II. In the year 714, the Saracens crossed the sea, which separates *Spain* from *Africa*, dispersed the army

of RODERIC king of the Spanish Goths [p], whose defeat was principally due to the treachery of their general JULIAN, and made themselves masters of the greatest part of the territories of this vanquished prince. About the same time the empire of the Visigoths, which had subsisted in *Spain* above three hundred years, was totally overturned by these fierce and savage invaders, who also took possession of all the maritime coasts of *Gaul* from the Pyrenean mountains to the river *Rhone*, from whence they made frequent excursions, and ravaged the neighbouring countries with fire and sword.

The rapid progress of these bold invaders was, indeed, checked by CHARLES MARTEL, who gained a signal victory over them in a bloody action near the city of *Poitiers*, A. D. 732 [q]. But the vanquished spoilers soon recovered their strength and their ferocity, and returned with new violence to their devastations. This engaged CHARLEMAGNE to lead a formidable army into *Spain*, with a design to deliver that whole country from the oppressive yoke of the Saracens: but this grand enterprise, though it did not entirely miscarry, was not, however, attended with the signal success that was expected from it [r]. The inroads of this warlike people were felt by many of the western provinces, besides those of *France* and *Spain*. Several parts of *Italy* suffered from their incursions; the island of *Sardinia* was reduced under their yoke; and *Sicily* was ravaged and oppressed by them in the most inhuman manner. Hence the Christian religion in *Spain* and *Sardinia* suffered inexpressibly under these violent usurpers.

In *Germany*, and the adjacent countries, the Christians were assailed by another sort of enemies; for all such as

[p] JO. MARIANA, *Rerum Hispanicarum*, lib. vi, cap. xxi. EUSEB. RENAUDOT. *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 253. JO. de FERRERAS, *Histoire de l'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 425.

[q] PAULUS DIACONUS, *De gestis Longobard.* lib. vi. cap. xvi. liii. JO. MARIANA, *Rerum. Hispan.* lib. vii. cap. iii. BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article ABDEBRAMUS. FERRERAS, *Hist. d'Espagne*, tom. ii p. 463.

[r] HENR. de BUNAU, *Teutsche Kayser-und Reich's Histoire*, tom. ii. p. 392. FERRERAS. *Hist. d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 506.

C E N T.
VIII.

adhered to the Pagan superstitions beheld them with the most inveterate hatred, and persecuted them with the most unrelenting violence and fury [s]. Hence, in several places, castles and fortresses were erected to restrain the incursions of these Barbarian zealots.

[s] SERVATI LUPI *vita Wigberti*, p. 304.

P A R T II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

C H A P T E R I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

The state of
learning a-
mong the
Greeks.

I. **T**HERE were not wanting among the Greeks men of genius and talents, who might have contributed to prevent the total decline of literature; but their zeal was damped by the tumults and desolations that reigned in the empire, and while both church and state were menaced with approaching ruin, the learned were left destitute of that protection which gives both vigour and success to the culture of the arts and sciences. Hence few or none of the Greeks were at all famous either for elegance of diction, true wit, copious erudition, or a zealous attachment to the study of philosophy, and the investigation of truth. Frigid homilies, insipid narrations of the exploits of pretended saints, vain and subtle disputes about unessential and trivial subjects, vehement and bombastic declamations for or against the erection and worship of images, histories composed without method or judgment; such were monuments of Grecian learning in this miserable age.

The progress
of the Aris-
totelian phi-
losophy.

II. It must, however, be observed, that the Aristotelian philosophy was taught every where in the public schools, and was propagated in all places with considerable

able success. The doctrine of PLATO had lost all its credit in the schools, after the repeated sentences of condemnation that had been passed upon the opinions of ORIGEN, and the troubles which the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies had excited in the church; so that Platonism now was almost confined to the solitary retreats of the monastic orders. Of all the writers in this century, who contributed to the illustration and progress of the Aristotelian philosophy, the most eminent was JOHN DAMASCENUS, who composed a concise, plain, and comprehensive view of the doctrines of the Stagirite, for the instruction of the more ignorant, and, in a manner adapted to common capacities. This little work excited numbers, both in *Greece* and *Syria*, to the study of that philosophy, whose proselytes, increased daily. The Nestorians and Jacobites were also extremely diligent to the study of ARISTOTLE's writings, from whence they armed themselves with sophisms and quibbles, which they employed against the Greeks in the controversy concerning the natures and person of CHRIST.

III. The literary history of the Latins exhibits innumerable instances of the grossest ignorance [a], which will not, however, appear surprizing to such, as consider, with attention, the state of *Europe* in this century. If we except some poor remains of learning, which were yet to be found at *Rome* and in certain cities of *Italy* [b], the sciences seemed to have abandoned the continent, and to have fixed their residence in *Britain* and *Ireland* [c]. Those, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were distinguished by their learning and genius, were all (a few French and Italians excepted) either British or Scotch, such as ALCUIN, BEDE, EGBERT, CLEMENS, DUNGALLUS, ACCA, and others. CHARLEMAGNE, whose political talents were embellished by a considerable degree of learning, and an ardent zeal

The revival
of learning
among the
Latins by
Charle-
magne

[a] Vid. STEPH. BALUZ. *Observat. ad Reginonem Prumiensem*, p. 540.

[b] LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiq. Italicæ mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. p.

811.

[c] JAC. USSERIUS *Præf. ad Syllogem Epistolarum Hibernicarum*.

CENT.
VIII.

for the culture of the sciences, endeavoured to dispel the profound ignorance that reigned in his dominions; in which excellent undertaking he was animated and directed by the counsels of *ALCUIN*. With this view he drew first from *Italy*, and afterwards from *Britain* and *Ireland*; by his liberality, eminent men, who had distinguished themselves in the various branches of literature; and excited the several orders of the clergy and monks by various encouragements, and the nobility, and others of eminent rank, by his own example, to the pursuit of knowledge in all its branches, human and divine.

Cathedral
and monastic
schools erected.

IV. In the prosecution of this noble design, the greatest part of the bishops erected, by the express order of the emperor, cathedral schools (so called from their lying contiguous to the principal church in each diocese) in which the youth, which were set apart for the service of *CHRIST*, received a learned and religious education. Those also of the abbots, who had any zeal for the cause of Christianity, opened schools in their monasteries, in which the more learned of the fraternity instructed such as were designed for the monastic state, or the sacerdotal order, in the Latin language, and other branches of learning suitable to their future destination. It was formerly believed, that the university of *Paris* was erected by *CHARLEMAGNE*; but this opinion is rejected by such as have studied, with impartiality, the history of this age; though it is undeniably evident that this great prince had the honour of laying, in some measure, the foundation of that noble institution, and that the beginnings from which it arose were owing entirely to him [d]. Be that as it may, the zeal of this emperor, for the propagation and advancement of letters, was, undoubtedly, very great, and manifested its ardor by a

[d] The reasons that have been used, to prove *CHARLEMAGNE* the founder of the university of *Paris*, are accurately collected in *Du Boulay's Historia Academiae Paris.* tom. i. p. 91. But they have been refuted by the following learned men in a victorious manner, viz. *MABILLON, Añ. Sanct. Ord. Benedicti*, tom. v. *Præf.* § 181, 182. *LAURIER, CLAUD. JOLY, De scholis.*

considera-

considerable number of excellent establishments; nor among others must we pass in silence the famous *Palatine* school, which he erected with a view to banish ignorance from his court; and in which the princes of the blood, and the children of the nobility, were educated by the most learned and illustrious masters of the times [e].

V. These excellent establishments were not, however, attended with the desired success; nor was the improvement of the youth, in learning and virtue, at all proportioned to the pains that were taken, and the bounty that was bestowed to procure them a liberal education. This, indeed, will not appear surprizing, when we consider that the most learned and renowned masters of those times were men of very little genius and abilities, and that their system of erudition and philosophy was nothing more than a lean and ghastly skeleton equally unfit for ornament and use. The whole circle of sciences was composed of, what they called, the seven liberal arts, viz. grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy [f]; the three former of which they distinguished by the title of *trivium*, and the four latter by that of *quadrivium*. Nothing can be conceived more wretchedly barbarous than the manner in which these sciences were taught, as we may easily perceive from *ALCUIN*'s treatise concerning them [g]; and the dissertations of *St. AUGUSTIN* on the same subject, which were in the highest repute at this time. In the greatest part of the schools, the public teachers ventured no further than the *trivium*, and confined their instructions to grammar, rhetoric, and logic: they, however, who, after passing the *trivium*, and also the

But not attended with the desired success.

[e] BOULAY, *Histor. Academ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 281. MABILLON, c. § 179.

[f] HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquitat. Academicæ*, Diff. iii. p. 80. AC. THOMASII *Programmata*, p. 368. *Observation. Halensium*, tom. vi. *Observ.* xiv. p. 118.

[g] *ALCUINI Opera*, part. ii. p. 1245. edit. Quercetani. It is, however, to be observed, that the treatise of *ALCUIN* here referred to, is not only imperfect, but is also almost entirely transcribed from *CASIMIR* DODORE.

CENT. VIII. *quadrivium*, were desirous of rising yet higher in their literary pursuits, were exhorted to apply themselves to the study of CASSIODORE and BOETHIUS, as if the progress of human knowledge was bounded by the discoveries of those two learned writers.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The vices of
the clergy.

I. **T**HAT corruption of manners, which dishonoured the clergy in the former century, increased, instead of diminishing, in this, and discovered itself under the most odious characters, both in the eastern and western provinces. In the east there arose the most violent dissensions and quarrels among the bishops and doctors of the church, who, forgetting the duties of their stations, and the cause of CHRIST in which they were engaged, threw the state into combustion by their outrageous clamours, and their scandalous divisions; and even went so far as to embrue their hands in the blood of their brethren who differed from them in opinion. In the western world, Christianity was not less disgraced by the lives and actions of those who pretended to be the luminaries of the church, and who ought to have been so in reality by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themselves to their passions without moderation or restraint; they were distinguished by their luxury, their gluttony, and their lust; they gave themselves up to dissipations of various kinds, to the pleasures of hunting, and, what was still more remote from their sacred character, to military studies and enterprizes [b]. They had also so far extinguished every principle of fear and shame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted against their vices by CARLOMAN, PEPIN, and CHARLEMAGNE at all contribute to set

[b] STEPH. BALUZIUS, *ad Reginon. Prumiensem*, p. 563. WILKINS'S *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i. p. 90.

bounds to their licentiousness, or to bring about their reformation [i].

CENT.
VIII.

II. It is, indeed, amazing, that, notwithstanding the shocking nature of such vices, especially in a set of men whose profession obliged them to display to the world the attracting lustre of virtuous example; and notwithstanding the perpetual troubles and complaints which these vices occasioned; the clergy were still held, corrupt as they were, in the highest veneration, and were honoured, as a sort of deities, by the submissive multitude. This veneration for the bishops and clergy, and the influence and authority it gave them over the people, were, indeed, carried much higher in the western than in the eastern provinces; and the reasons of this difference will appear manifest to such as consider the customs and manners that prevailed among the barbarous nations, which were, at this time, masters of *Europe*, before their conversion to Christianity. All these nations, during their continuance under the darkness of paganism, were absolutely enslaved to their priests, without whose counsel and authority they transacted nothing of the least importance, either in civil or military affairs [k]. Upon their conversion to Christianity, they,

The veneration in which the clergy were held in the west.

[i] STEPH. BALUZ. *Capitular. Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 189. 208. 275. 493, &c.

[k] JULIUS CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. v. c. 13. "Druides magno sunt apud eos honore: nam fere de omnibus controversiis, publicis privatisque constituunt; et, si quod est admissum facinus, si cædes facta, si de hæreditate, si de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt præmia, pœnasque constituunt: si qui aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdiciunt Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt: militiæ vacationem, omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. Tantis excitati præmiis, et sua sponte multi in disciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquisque mittuntur." TACITUS (*De mor. Germanorum*, cap. vii. p. 384. edit. Gronov.) expresses also the power and authority of the priests or Druids in the following terms: "Neque enim animadvertere, neque vincere, neque verberare quidem, nisi sacerdotibus permissum, non quasi in pœnam, nec ducis jussu, sed velut Deo imperante." And again, cap. ii. "Silentium per sacerdotes, quibus et tum coercendi jus est, imperatur." HELMOLDUS, *Chron. Slavorum*, lib. i. cap. xxxv. expresses himself to the same purpose, "Ma-

CENT.
VIII.

they, therefore, thought proper to transfer to the ministers of their new religion, the rights and privileges of their former priests: and the Christian bishops, in their turn, were not only ready to accept the offer, but used all their diligence and dexterity to secure and assert to themselves, and their successors, the dominion and authority which, the ministers of paganism had usurped over an ignorant and brutish people.

Their riches
increased,
and their
privileges
multiplied.

III. The honours and privileges which the western nations had voluntarily conferred upon the bishops, and other doctors of the church, were now augmented with new and immense accessions of opulence and authority. The endowments of the churches and monasteries, and the revenues of the bishops, were hitherto considerable; but in this century a new and ingenious method was found out of acquiring much greater riches to the church, and of increasing its wealth through succeeding ages. An opinion prevailed universally at this time, though its first authors are not known, that the punishment which the righteous judge of the world has reserved for the transgressions of the wicked, was to be prevented and annulled, by liberal donations to God, to the saints, to the churches and clergy. In consequence of this notion, the great and opulent, who were, generally speaking, the most remarkable for their flagitious and abominable lives, offered out of the abundance which they had received by inheritance, or acquired, by rapine, rich donations to departed saints, their ministers upon earth, and the keepers of the temples that were erected in their honour, in order to a-

“*jor Flaminis, quam Regis, apud ipsos veneratio est.*” And again lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 235. “*Rex apud eos modicæ æstimationis est comparatione Flaminis. Ille enim responsa perquiri—Rex et populus ad illius nutum pendent.*” This ancient custom of honouring their priests and submitting, in all things, to their decisions, was still preserved by the Germans, and the other European nations, after their conversion to Christianity: and this furnishes a satisfactory answer to that question, *viz.* How it came to pass, that the Christian priesthood obtained in the west that enormous degree of authority, which is so contrary to the positive precepts of CHRIST, and the nature and genius of his divine religion.

void

void the sufferings and penalties annexed by the priests to transgression in this life [1], and to escape the misery denounced against the wicked in a future state. This new and commodious method of making atonement for iniquity, was the principle source of those immense treasures, which, from this period, began to flow in upon the clergy, the churches, and monasteries, and continued to enrich them through succeeding ages down to the present time [m].

CENT.
VIII.

IV. But here it is highly worthy of observation, that the donations which princes and persons of the first rank presented, in order to make expiation for their sins, and to satisfy the justice of God, and the demands of the clergy, did not only consist in those *private* professions, which every citizen may enjoy, and with which the churches and convents were already abundantly enriched; no: these donations were carried to a much more extravagant length, and the church was endowed with several of those *public* grants, which are peculiar to princes and sovereign states, and which are commonly called *regalia*, or royal domains. Emperors, kings, and princes signalized their superstitious veneration for the clergy, by investing bishops, churches, and monasteries in the possession of whole provinces, cities, castles, and fortresses, with all the rights and prerogatives of sovereignty that were annexed to them under the dominion of their former masters.

They are
invested
with princi-
palities and
royal do-
mains.

[1] The temporal penalties here mentioned were rigorous fasts, bodily pains and mortifications, long and frequent prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and martyrs, and such like austerities. These were the penalties, which the priests imposed upon such as had confessed their crimes; and as they were singularly grievous to those who had led voluptuous lives, and were desirous of continuing in the same course of licentious pleasure, effeminacy, and ease; the richer sort of transgressors embraced eagerly this new method of expiation, and willingly gave a part of their substance to avoid such severe and rigorous penalties.

[m] Hence, by a known form of speech, they, who offered donations to the church or clergy, were said to do this for *the redemption of their soul*; and the gifts themselves were generally called *the price of transgression*. See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Diff. de Redemptione Peccatorum*, in his *Antiquitat. Italicae* *lib. vii*, tom. v. p. 712.

CENT.
VIII.

Hence it came to pass that they, who, by their holy profession, were appointed to proclaim to the world the vanity of human grandeur, and to inspire into the minds of men, by their instructions and their example, a noble contempt of sublunary things; became, themselves, scandalous spectacles of worldly pomp, ambition, and splendor, were created *dukes, counts, and marquises*, judges, legislators, and sovereigns; and not only gave laws to nations, but also, upon many occasions, gave battle to their enemies at the head of numerous armies of their own raising. It is here that we are to look for the source of those dreadful tumults and calamities, that spread desolation through *Europe* in after times, particularly of those bloody wars concerning *investitures*, and those obstinate contentions and disputes about the *regalia*.

The causes
of this excessive
liberality to the
clergy.

V. The excessive donations that were made to the clergy, and that extravagant liberality that augmented daily the treasures of the European churches (to which these donations and this liberality were totally confined) began in this century; nor do we find any examples of the like munificence in preceding times. From hence we may conclude, that these donations were owing to customs peculiar to the European nations, and to the maxims of policy that were established among those warlike people. The kings of those nations, who were also employed either in usurpation, or self-defence, endeavoured, by all means, to attach warmly to their interest those whom they considered as their friends and clients; and, for this purpose, they distributed among them extensive territories, cities, and fortresses, with the various rights and privileges belonging to them, reserving to themselves no more than the supreme dominion, and also the military service of their powerful vassals. This then being the method of governing customary in *Europe*, it was esteemed by princes a high instance of political prudence to distribute among the bishops, and other Christian doctors, the same sort of donations that they had formerly made to their generals and clients; for it is not to be believed, that super-

stitution

stitution alone was always the principle that drew forth C E N T. VIII.
 their liberality. They expected more fidelity and loyalty from a set of men, who were bound by the obligations of religion, and consecrated to the service of God, than from a body of nobility composed of fierce and impetuous warriors, and accustomed to little else than blood-shed and rapine. And they hoped also to check the seditious and turbulent spirits of their vassals, and maintain them, in their obedience, by the influence and authority of the bishops, whose commands were highly respected, and whose spiritual thunder-bolts, rendered formidable by ignorance, struck terror into the boldest and most resolute hearts [n].

VI. This

[n] The account here given of the rise of the clergy to such enormous degrees of opulence and authority is corroborated by the following remarkable passage of WILLIAM of MALMESBURY (Lib. v. *De rebus gestis regum Angliæ*) “ Carolus Magnus pro contundenda gentium illarum ferocia, omnes pene terras ecclesiis contulerat, consiliofissime perpendens, nolle facri ordinis homines, tam facile quam Laicos, fidelitatem Domini rejicere: præterea si Laici rebellarent, illos posse excommunicationis auctoritate et potentia severitate compescere.” This is, doubtless, the true reason why CHARLEMAGNE, who was far from being a superstitious prince, or a slave to the clergy, augmented so vastly the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff in Germany, Italy, and the other countries, where he had extended his conquests, and accumulated upon the bishops such ample possessions. He expected more loyalty and submission from the clergy than from the laity, and he augmented the riches and authority of the former, in order to secure his throne against the assaults of the latter. As the bishops were universally held in the highest veneration, he made use of their influence in checking the rebellious spirit of his dukes, counts, and knights, who were frequently very troublesome. CHARLEMAGNE, for instance, had much to fear from the dukes of *Benevento*, *Spoleto*, and *Capua*, when the government of the Lombards was overturned: he therefore made over a considerable part of *Italy* to the *Roman* pontiff, whose ghostly authority, opulence, and threatnings were so proper to restrain those powerful and vindictive princes from seditious insurrections, or to quell such tumults as they might venture to excite. Nor was CHARLEMAGNE the only prince who honoured the clergy from such political views; the other kings and princes of *Europe* acted much in the same manner and from the same principles, as will appear evident to all who consider, with attention, the forms of government, and the methods of governing that took place in this century. So that the excessive augmentation of sacerdotal opulence and authority, which many look upon as the work of superstition alone, was, in many instances, an effect of political

CENT.
VIII.Particularly
to the Ro-
man pontiff.

VI. This prodigious accession to the opulence and authority of the clergy in the west began at their head, the Roman pontiff, and spread gradually from thence among the inferior bishops, and also among the sacerdotal and monastic orders. The barbarous nations, who received the gospel, looked upon the bishop of *Rome*, as the successor of their chief *druid*, or high priest. And as this tremendous druid had enjoyed, under the darkness of paganism, a boundless authority, and had been treated with a degree of veneration, that, through its servile excess, degenerated into terror; so the barbarous nations, upon their conversion to Christianity, thought proper to confer upon the chief of the bishops the same honours and the same authority that had formerly been vested in their *arch-druid* [o]. The Roman pontiff received, with something more than a mere ghostly delight, these august privileges; and lest upon any change of affairs attempts might be made to deprive him of them, he strengthened his title to these extraordinary honours, by a variety of passages drawn from ancient history, and, what was still more astonishing, by arguments of a religious nature. This conduct of a superstitious people swelled the arrogance of the Roman druid to an enormous size; and gave to the see of *Rome* that high pre-eminence and that despotic authority in civil and political matters, that were unknown to former ages. Hence, among other unhappy circumstances, arose that monstrous and most pernicious opinion, that such persons as were excluded from the communion of the church by the pontiff himself, or any of the bishops, forfeited thereby not only their civil rights and advantages as citizens, but even the com-

political prudence. We shall consider, presently, the terrors of *excommunication*, which WILLIAM of MALMESBURY touches but cursorily in the latter words of the passages above quoted.

[o] CÆSAR speaks thus of the chief or arch-druid: "His omnibus
" Druidibus præest unus, qui SUMMAM inter eos (Celtas) habet aucto-
" ritatem. Hoc mortuo si qui ex reliquis excellit dignitate, succedit.
" At si sunt plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur: nonnunquam
" etiam armis de principatu contendunt." Vide JUL. CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii.

mon

non claims and privileges of humanity. This horrid opinion, which was a fatal source of wars, massacres, and rebellions without number, and which contributed more than any thing else to augment and confirm the papal authority, was, unhapily for *Europe*, borrowed by Christians, or rather by the clergy, from the Pagan superstitions [p].

[p] Though *excommunication*, from the time of CONSTANTINE the Great, was, in every part of the Christian world, attended with many disagreeable effects, yet its highest terrors were confined to *Europe*, where its aspect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired also, in the eighth century, new accessions of terror; so that, from that period, the *excommunication* practised in *Europe* differed entirely from that which was in use in other parts of *Christendom*. Excommunicated persons were indeed considered, in all places, as objects of aversion both to God and men: but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, nor of the rights of humanity; much less were those kings and princes, whom an insolent bishop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, supposed to forfeit, on that account, their crowns or their territories. But, from this century, it was quite otherwise in *Europe*; excommunication received that infernal power which dissolved all connections; so that those whom the bishops, or their chief, excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beasts. Under this horrid sentence the king, the ruler, the husband, the father, nay, even the *man* forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of society. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: Upon the conversion of the barbarous nations to Christianity, these new and ignorant profelytes confounded the *excommunication* in use among Christians with that which had been practised in the times of paganism by the priests of the gods, and considered them as of the same nature and effect. The Roman pontiffs, on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error, and, therefore, employed all sorts of means to gain credit to an opinion so proper to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandize, in general, the episcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extensive and horrid influence of the European and Papal excommunication, will appear evident to such as cast an eye upon the following passage of CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii. “ Si qui aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc poena est apud eos gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum et sceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque iis petentibus jus REDDITUR, neque honos ullus communicatur.”

C E N T.
VIII.

The Roman pontiff obtains an addition to his authority, by favouring the ambition of Pepin.

VII. We see in the annals of the French nation the following remarkable and shocking instance of the enormous power that was, at this time, vested in the Roman pontiff. PEPIN, who was *mayor of the palace* to CHILDERIC III, and who, in the exercise of that high office, was possessed, in reality, of the royal power and authority; not contented with this, aspired to the titles and honours of majesty, and formed the design of dethroning his sovereign. For this purpose the states of the realm were assembled by PEPIN, A. D. 751; and though they were devoted to the interests of this ambitious usurper, they gave it as their opinion, that the bishop of *Rome* was previously to be consulted, whether the execution of such a project was lawful or not. In consequence of this, ambassadors were sent by PEPIN to ZACHARY, the reigning pontiff, with the following question: *Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the state?* The situation of ZACHARY, who stood much in need of the succours of PEPIN against the Greeks and Lombards, rendered his answer such as the usurper desired. And when his favourable decision of the Roman oracle was published in *France*, the unhappy CHILDERIC was stript of his royalty without the least opposition; and PEPIN, without the smallest resistance from any quarter, stepped into the throne of his master and his sovereign. Let the abettors of the papal authority see, how they can justify in CHRIST's pretended vice-gerent upon earth a decision, which is so glaringly repugnant to the laws and precepts of the divine Saviour [q]. This decision was solemnly

[q] See LE COINTE *Annal. Franciæ Eccles.* MEZERAY, DANIEL, and the other Gallic and German historians, concerning this important event, but particularly BOSSUET *Defens. declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, part I. p. 225. PETR. RIVAL *Dissertationes Histor. et Critique sur divers sujets*, Diff. ii. p. 70. Diff. iii. p. 156. Lond. 1726, in 8vo. HENR. de BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 288. This remarkable

solemnly confirmed by STEPHEN II, the successor of ZACHARY, who undertook a journey into *France*, in the year 754, in order to solicit assistance against the Lombards; and who, at the same time, dissolved the obligation of the oath of fidelity and allegiance which PEPIN had sworn to CHILDERIC, and violated, by his usurpation, in the year 751. And to render his title to the crown as sacred as possible, STEPHEN anointed and crowned him, with his wife and two sons, for the second time [r].

VIII. This compliance of the Roman pontiffs proved an abundant source of opulence and credit to the church, and to its aspiring ministers. When that part of *Italy*, which was as yet subject to the Grecian empire, was involved in confusion and trouble, by the seditions and tumults which arose from the imperial edicts [s],

The advantages derived to the see of *Rome* from the attachment of its bishops to the king of *France*.

against

able event is not, indeed, related in the same manner by all historians, and it is generally represented under the falsest colours by those, who, from a spirit of blind zeal and excessive adulation, seize every occasion of exalting the dignity and authority of the bishops of *Rome*. Such writers assert, that it was by ZACHARY's authority as pontiff, and not, in consequence of his opinion as a casuist or divine, that the crown was taken from the head of CHILDERIC, and placed upon that of PEPIN. But this the French absolutely and justly deny. Had it, however, been so, the crime of the pontiff would have been much greater than it was in reality.

[(r) PEPIN had been anointed, by the legate BONIFACE at *Soissons*, soon after his election; but thinking that ceremony performed by the pope, would recommend him more to the respect of his subjects, he desired that it should be performed anew by STEPHEN. PEPIN is the first French monarch, who received this unction as a ceremony of coronation, at least according to the reports of the most credible historians. His predecessors were proclaimed by being lifted up on a shield, and the *holy phial* of CLOVIS is now universally regarded as fabulous. The custom of anointing kings at their coronation was, however, more ancient than the time of PEPIN, and was observed long before that period both in *Scotland* and *Spain*. See EDMUND MARTENE, *De Antiq. Eccles. Ritib.* tom. iii. cap. x. As also BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366.]

[(s) The author has here in view the edicts of LEO ISAURICUS and CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS. The former published, in the year 726, a famous edict against the worship of images, which occasioned many contests and much disturbance both in church and state; and the latter assembled at *Constantinople*, in the year 754, a council of

CENT.
VIII.

against the erection and worship of images; the kings of the Lombards employed the united influence of their arms and negotiations in order to terminate these contests. Their success, indeed, was only advantageous to themselves; for they managed matters so as to become, by degrees, masters of the Grecian provinces in *Italy*, which were subject to the Exarch, who resided at *Ravenna*. Nay, one of these monarchs, named AISTULPHUS, carried his views still further. Elated with these new accessions to his dominions, he meditated the conquest of *Rome* and its territory, and formed the ambitious project of reducing all *Italy* under the yoke of the Lombards. The terrified pontiff, STEPHEN II, addresses himself to his powerful patron and protector PEPIN, represents to him his deplorable condition, and implores his assistance. The French monarch embarks, with zeal, in the cause of the suppliant pontiff; crosses the *Alps*, A. D. 754, with a numerous army; and having defeated AISTULPHUS, obliged him, by a solemn treaty, to deliver up to the see of *Rome* the exarchate of *Ravenna*, *Pentapolis*, and all the cities, castles, and territories which he had seized in the Roman dukedom. It was not, however, long before the Lombard prince violated, without remorse, an engagement which he had entered into with reluctance. In the year 755 he laid siege to *Rome* for the second time, but was again obliged to sue for peace by the victorious arms of PEPIN, who returned into *Italy*, and forcing the Lombard to execute the treaty he had so audaciously violated, made a new grant of the exarchate [t], and of *Pentapolis* to the Roman pontiff

The donation of Pepin to that see.

338 bishops, who unanimously condemned not only the *worship*, but also the *use*, of images.]

[t] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiae*, lib. iii. p. 202. tom. ii. Opp. BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366. MURATORI *Annali d'Ital.* tom. iv. p. 310. The real limits of the *exarchate*, granted by PEPIN to the Roman pontiff, have been much controverted among the learned, and have, particularly in our times, employed the researches of several eminent writers. The bishops of *Rome* extend the limits of this *exarchate* as far as they can with any appearance of decency or probability; while their adversaries are as zealous

iff and his successors in the apostolic see of St. PETER. CENT. VIII.
 And thus was the bishop of Rome raised to the rank of
 a temporal prince.

IX. After the death of PEPIN, a new attack was made upon the patrimony of St. PETER, by DIDERIC Charle-
magne's
grant to the
see of Rome. king of the Lombards, who invaded the territories that had been granted by the French monarch to the see of Rome. In this extremity, ADRIAN I, who was pontiff at that time, fled for succour to CHARLES, the son of PEPIN, who, on account of his heroic exploits, was afterwards distinguished by the name of CHARLEMAGNE. This prince, whose enterprising genius led him to seize with avidity every opportunity of extending his conquests, and whose veneration for the Roman see was carried very far, as much from the dictates of policy as superstition, adopted immediately the cause of the trembling pontiff. He passed the Alps with a formidable army A. D. 774, overturned the empire of the Lombards in Italy, which had subsisted above two hundred years, thus in contracting this famous grant within narrow bounds. See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, cap. i, ii. is also his *Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 64. 68. 986, 987. The same author treats the matter with more circumspection, tom. v. p. 90. This controversy can only be terminated with facility by an inspection of PEPIN's grant of the territory in question. FONTANINI, in his *First defence of the temporal jurisdiction of the see of Rome over the city of Commachio*, written in Italian, intimates, that this grant is still a being, and even makes use of some phrases that are contained in it (see the pages 242 and 346 of that work). This, however, will scarcely be believed. Were it, indeed, true that such a deed is yet in being, its being published to the world would be, undoubtedly, unfavourable to the pretensions and interests of the church of Rome. It is at least certain, that in the recent dispute between the emperor JOSEPH and the Roman pontiff concerning the city of Commachio; the partisans of the latter, though frequently called upon by those of the emperor to produce this grant, refused constantly to comply with this demand. On the other hand it must be confessed, that BLANCHINUS, in his *Prologom. ad Anastasium de vitis pontif. Rom.* p. 55. has given us, from a Varnesian manuscript, a specimen of this grant, which seems to carry the marks of a remote antiquity. Be that as it may, a multitude of witnesses unite in assuring us, that the remorse of a wounded conscience was the source of PEPIN's liberality, and that his grant to the Roman pontiff was the superstitious remedy by which he hoped to exiate his enormities, and particularly his horrid perfidy to his master CHILDERIC.

sent

CENT.
VIII.

sent their exiled monarch into *France*, and proclaimed himself king of the Lombards. These conquests offered to CHARLEMAGNE an occasion of visiting *Rome*, where he not only confirmed the grants which had been made by his father to that see, but added to them new donations, and made to the Roman pontiffs a cession of several cities and provinces in *Italy*, which had not been contained in PEPIN's grant. What those cities and provinces were, is a question difficult to be resolved at this period of time, as it is perplexed with much obscurity, from the want of authentic records, by which alone it can be decided with certainty [u].

X. By

[u] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiae*, lib. iii. p. 223. tom. ii. Opp. BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 368. PETRUS de MARCA, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67. LUD. ANTON. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, cap. ii. p. 147. CONRINGIUS, *De Imperio Roman. German.* cap. vi. The extent of CHARLEMAGNE's grant to the see of *Rome* is as much disputed as that of PEPIN's, between the partisans of the popes, and those of the emperors. They, who plead the cause of the Roman see, maintain, that *Corfica*, *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, the territory of *Sabino*, the duchy of *Spoletto*, and several other places were solemnly granted, by CHARLEMAGNE, to St. PETER and his successors. They, on the other hand, who assert the rights of the emperor, diminish, as far as they can, the munificence of CHARLES, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. The reader may consult upon this subject the authors of the present age, who have published their opinions concerning the pretensions of the emperors and the popes to the cities of *Commachio* and *Florence*, and the duchies of *Parma* and *Placentia*; but above all, the learned BERRET's excellent treatise, intitled, *Dissertation Chorographica de Italia medii ævi*, f. 33. The spirit of party seems, in this controversy, as in many others, to have blinded the disputants on both sides of the question; and this, together with the difficulty of avoiding mistakes upon a point involved in such deep obscurity, has, in many cases, rendered the truth invisible to both the contending parties. With respect to the motives that induced CHARLEMAGNE to make this grant, they are much less doubtful than the extent of the grant itself. ADRIAN affirms, that the monarch's view was to atone for his sins by this act of liberality to the church, as we see in a letter from that pontiff to CHARLEMAGNE, which is published in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 265. and of which the following passage is remarkable: "Venientes ad nos de Capua, quam Beato Petro apostolorum principi pro mercede animæ vestræ, atque sempiterna memoria cum cæteris civitatibus obtulistis." It is not indeed unlikely, that CHARLEMAGNE

X. By this act of liberality, which seems to carry in C E N T. VIII.

the contradictory characters of policy and imprudence, CHARLEMAGNE opened for himself a passage to the empire of the west, and to the supreme dominion over the city of *Rome* and its territory, upon which the western empire seemed then to depend [w]. He had, no doubt, been mediating for a considerable time this arduous project, which his father PEPIN had probably formed before him; but the circumstances of the times obliged him to wait for a favourable occasion of putting it in execution. This was offered him in the year 800, when the affairs of the Greeks were reduced to the utmost extremity after the death of LEO III, and the barbarous murder of his son CONSTANTINE, and while the pious IRENE held the reins of empire. This favourable opportunity was seized with avidity by CHARLES, who set out for *Rome*, where he was received with the utmost demonstrations of zeal by the sovereign pontiff [x], who had entered into his views, and persuaded the people, elated at this time with high notions of their independency and elective power, to unite

The motives to which it is to be attributed.

who affected that kind of piety which was the characteristic of this barbarous age, mentioned this superstitious motive in the act of cession by which he confirmed his donation to the church; but such as are acquainted with the character of this prince, and the history of this period, will be cautious in attributing his generosity to this religious principle alone. His grand motive was, undoubtedly, of an ambitious kind; he was obstinately bent upon adding the western empire to his dominions, and the success of this grand project depended much upon the consent and assistance of the Roman pontiff, whose approbation, in those times, was sufficient to sanctify the most iniquitous projects; so that CHARLEMAGNE lavished gifts upon the bishops of *Rome*, that, by their assistance, he might assume, with a certain air of decency, the empire of the west, and confirm his new dominion in *Italy*. This policy we have taken notice of already, and it must appear manifest to all who view things with the smallest degree of impartiality and attention.

[w] CHARLES, in reality, was already emperor of the west, that is, the most powerful of the European monarchs. He wanted, therefore, nothing more than the title of emperor, and the supreme dominion in *Rome* and its territory, both of which he obtained by the assistance of LEO III.

[x] LEO III, VOL. II. their

CENT.
VIII.The nature
and form of
the Roman
pontiff's ju-
risdiction.

their suffrages in favour of this prince, and to proclaim him emperor of the west [y].

XI. CHARLES, upon his elevation to the empire of the west and the government of *Rome*, seems to have reserved to himself only the supreme dominion, and the unalienable rights of majesty, and to have granted to the church of *Rome* a subordinate jurisdiction over that great city, and its annexed territory [z]. This grant was

[y] See the historians who have transmitted to us accounts of this century. and more especially BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Romano-Germanici* tom. ii. p. 537. The partisans of the Roman pontiffs generally maintain, that LEO III, by a *divine* right, vested in him as bishop of *Rome* transported the western empire from the Greeks to the Franks, and conferred it upon CHARLEMAGNE, the monarch of the latter. From hence they conclude, that the Roman pontiff, as the vicar of CHRIST is the supreme lord of the whole earth, and, in a particular manner of the Roman empire. The temerity of these pretensions, and the absurdity of this reasoning, are exposed with much learning and judgment by the celebrated FRED. SPANHEIM, *De fide translatione imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem III*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 557.

[z] That CHARLEMAGNE, in effect, preserved entire his supreme authority over the city of *Rome* and its adjacent territory, gave law to the citizens by judges of his own appointment, punished malefactors, enjoyed the prerogatives and exercised all the functions of royalty, has been demonstrated by several of the learned in the most ample and satisfactory manner, and confirmed by the most unexceptionable and authentic testimonies. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to consult MURATORI'S *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, cap. vi. p. 77. And, indeed, they must have a strange power of resisting the clearest evidence, who are absurd enough to assert, as does FONTANINI, in his treatise, intitled, *Dominio della S. Sede sopra Comacina* Diff. i. c. 95, 96. that CHARLES sustained at *Rome* the character of the advocate of the Roman church, and not that of its sovereign or lord, the dominion of the pontiffs being unlimited and universal. On the other hand, we must acknowledge ingenuously that the power of the pontiff, both in the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory, was very great, and that, in several cases, he seemed to act with a princely authority. But the extent, and the foundations of that authority, are matters hid in the deepest obscurity, and have thereby given occasion to endless disputes. MURATORI maintains, in his work above cited p. 102. that the bishop of *Rome* discharged the function of *exarch*, or *vicar*, to the emperor, an opinion which CLEMENT XI. rejected as injurious to the papal dignity, and which, indeed, does not appear to have any solid foundation. After a careful examination of all the circumstances that can contribute towards the solution of this perplexed question, the most probable account of the matter seems to be this

undoubtedly suggested to him by the ambitious pontiff as a matter of sacred and indispensable obligation, and many fictitious deeds were probably produced to make out the pretensions, and justify the claims of the church to this high degree of temporal authority and civil jurisdiction. In order to reconcile the new emperor to this grant, it was, no doubt, alledged, that CONSTANTINE the GREAT, his renowned predecessor, when he removed the seat of the empire to *Constantinople*, delivered up *Rome*, the old metropolis, with its adjacent territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, to be possessed and governed by the church, and that with no other restriction than that this should be no detriment to his supreme dominion; and it was insinuated to CHARLES, that he could not depart from the rule established by that pious emperor, without incurring the wrath of God, and the indignation of St. PETER [a].

XII.

That the Roman pontiff possessed the city of *Rome* and its territory by the same right that he held the exarchate of *Ravenna* and the other lands of which he received the grant from CHARLEMAGNE; that is to say, that he possessed *Rome* as a feudal tenure, though charged with less marks of dependance than other fiefs generally are, on account of the lustre and dignity of a city which had been so long the capital of the empire. This opinion derives much strength from what we shall have occasion to observe in the following note, and it has the peculiar advantage of reconciling the jarring testimonies of ancient writers, and the various records of antiquity relating to this point.

[a] Most writers are of opinion that CONSTANTINE's pretended grant was posterior to this period, and was forged in the ninth century. It appears to me on the contrary that this fictitious grant was in being in the eighth century, and it is extremely probable that both ADRIAN and his successor LEO III. made use of it to persuade CHARLEMAGNE to that donation. In favour of this opinion, we have the unexceptionable testimony of ADRIAN himself in his letter to CHARLEMAGNE, which is published in MURATORI's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, tom. iii. part II. p. 194. and which is extremely worthy of an attentive perusal. In this letter, ADRIAN exhorts CHARLES, before his elevation to the empire, to order the restitution of all the grants and donations that had formerly been made to St. PETER, and to the church of *Rome*. In this demand also he distinguishes, in the plainest manner, the donation of CONSTANTINE from those of the other princes and emperors, and what is particularly remarkable, from the *exarchate* which was the gift of PEPIN, and even from the additions that CHARLES had already made to his father's grant; from whence we may justly conclude, that by the

CENT.
VIII.

The Grecian
emperors
check the
ambition of
the Roman
pontiffs, and
diminish
their reve-
nues.

XII. While the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs were rising to the greatest height by the events which we have now been relating, they received a mortifying check in consequence of a quarrel which broke out between these haughty pontiffs and the Grecian emperors. LEO the Isaurian, and his son CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, incensed at the zeal which GREGORY II and III discovered for the worship of images, not only confiscated the treasures and lands which the church of Rome possessed in *Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia*, but more

donation of CONSTANTINE, ADRIAN meant the city of Rome and its annexed territory. He speaks first of this grant in the following terms

"Deprecamur vestram Excellentiam ... pro Dei amore et ipsius
"clavigeri regni cœlorum ... ut secundum promissionem quam pollicemur
"estis eidem Dei apostolo PRO ANIMÆ VESTRÆ MERCEDE et stabilitate
"regni vestri, omnia nostris temporibus adimplere jubeatis ... et sic
"temporibus beati SILVESTRI Romani pontificis, a sanctæ recordationis
"piissimo CONSTANTINO M. Imperatore, PER EJUS LARGITATEM
"(here CONSTANTINE's donation is evidently mentioned) sancta De
"catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est,
"POTESTATEM in his Hesperiarum partibus LARGIRI dignatus est:
"et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris sancta De
"ecclesia germinet ... et amplius atque amplius exaltata permaneat.
"quia ecce novus Christianissimus Dei gratiâ Constantinus imperator
"(here we see CHARLES, who at that time was only a king, styled
"emperor by the pontiff, and compared with CONSTANTINE)
"temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctæ suæ ecclesiæ
"largiri dignatus est." So much for that part of the letter that relates

to CONSTANTINE's grant: as to the other donations which the pontiff evidently distinguishes from it, observe what follows: "SED

"CUNCTA ALIA quæ per diversos Imperatores, Patricios, etiam
"alios Deum timentes, PRO EORUM ANIMÆ MERCEDE ET VENIA

"DELICTORUM, in partibus Tusciæ, Spoletio, seu Benevento, atque

"Corsica, simul et Pavinensi patrimonio beato Petro apostolo concessa

"sunt, et per nefandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum spatium

"abstracta et ablata sunt vestris temporibus, restituantur." (The

pontiff intimates further, that all these grants were carefully preserved in

the office of the Lateran, and that he sends them to CHARLES by his

legates.) "Unde et plures donationes in sacro nostro scrinio Lateranensi

"reconditas habemus, tamen et pro satisfactione Christianissimi regis

"vestri, per jam fatos viros, ad demonstrandum eas vobis, direximus

"et pro hoc petimus eximiam præcellentiam vestram, ut in integro ipsarum

"patrimonia Beato PETRO et nobis restituere jubeatis." By this it appears,

that CONSTANTINE's grant was now in being among the archives

of the Lateran, and was sent to CHARLEMAGNE with the other donations

of kings and princes, whose examples were made use of to excite

his liberality to the church.

over withdrew the bishops of these countries, and also the various provinces and churches of *Illyricum*, from the jurisdiction of the Roman see, and subjected them to the spiritual dominion of the bishop of *Constantinople*. and so inflexibly were the Grecian emperors bent upon humbling the arrogance of the Roman pontiffs, that no treaties, supplications, nor threats could engage them to abandon their purpose, or to restore this rich and signal portion of St. PETER's patrimony to his greedy successors [b]. It is here that we must look for the original source, and the principal cause of that vehement contest between the Roman pontiff and the bishop of *Constantinople*, which, in the following century, divided the Greek and Latin churches, and was so pernicious to the interests and advancement of true Christianity. These lamentable divisions, which wanted no new incident to augment them, were, nevertheless, augmented by a controversy which arose, in this century, concerning the *Privation of the Holy Spirit*, which we shall have occasion to mention more largely in its proper place. But it is more than probable, that this controversy would have been terminated with the utmost facility, had not the spirits of the contending parties been previously exasperated by disputes founded upon avarice and ambition, and carried on, without either moderation or decency by the holy patriarchs of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, in defence of their respective pretensions.

XIII. The monastic discipline was extremely relaxed at this time both in the eastern and western provinces, and, as appears by the concurring testimonies of the writers of this century, was fallen into a total decay. The only monks who escaped this general corruption, were they who passed their days in the deserts of *Egypt*, *Syria*, and *Mesopotamia*, amidst the austerities of a wretched life, and remote from all the comforts of human society: yet the merit of having preserved their

The monastic discipline fallen into decay.

[b] See MICH. LE QUIEN's *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 96. among the Greek writers also THEOPHANES and others acknowledge the fact; but they are not entirely agreed about the reasons to which it is to be attributed.

CENT.
VIII.

discipline was sadly counterbalanced by the gross ignorance, the fanatical madness, and the sordid superstition that reigned among these miserable hermits. Those of the monastic orders who lived nearer cities and populous towns, troubled frequently the public tranquillity by the tumults and seditions they fomented among the multitude, so that it became necessary to check their rebellious ambition, by the severe laws that were enacted against them by CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, and other emperors. The greatest part of the western monks followed, at this time, the rule of St. BENEDICT; though there were every where convents which adopted the discipline of other orders [c]. But as they increased in opulence they lost sight of all rules, and submitted at length, to no other discipline than that of intemperance, voluptuousness, and sloth [d]. CHARLEMAGNE attempted, by various edicts, to put a stop to this growing evil; but his efforts were attended with little success [e].

The origin of
the order of
canons.

XIV. This universal depravity and corruption of the monks gave rise to a new order of priests in the west, which was a sort of a middle order between the *monks* or *regulars*, and the *secular clergy*. This new species of ecclesiastics adopted the monastic discipline and manner of life, so far as to have their dwelling and their table in common, and to assemble themselves at certain hours for divine service; but they entered not into the vows which were peculiar to the monks, and they were also appointed to discharge the ministerial functions in certain churches which were committed to their pastoral direction. These ecclesiastics were at first called *fratres dominici*, but soon after received the name of *canons* [f].

[c] See MABILLON *Præf. ad acta SS. Ord. Benedicti*, Sæc. i. p. 24. and Sæc. iv. part. I. p. 26.

[d] The author mentioned in the preceding note discourses with a noble frankness and courage concerning the corruption of the monks and its various causes, in the same work, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part. I. p. 64.*

[e] See the *Capitularia Carolia*, published by BALUZIUS, tom. i. p. 148. 157. 237. 355. 366. 375. 503. Laws, so severe, and so often repeated, shew evidently that the corruption of the monks must have been truly enormous.

[f] See LE BEUF *Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 174. the *Paris* edition, published in 1743, in 4^{to}.

The

The common opinion attributes the institution of this order to CHRODEGANGUS bishop of Metz: nor is this opinion destitute of truth [g]. For though before this time there were in *Italy, Africa*, and other provinces, convents of ecclesiastics, who lived after the manner of the *canons* [b]; yet CHRODEGANGUS, who, towards the middle of this century, subjected to this rule the clergy of Metz, not only added to their religious ceremonies the custom of singing hymns and anthems to God, at certain hours, and probably a variety of other rites, but also, by his example, excited the Franks, the Italians, and the Germans to distinguish themselves by their zeal in favour of the *canons*, to erect monasteries for them, and to introduce their rule into their respective countries.

XV. The supreme dominion over the church and its possessions was vested in the emperors and kings, both in the eastern and the western world. The sovereignty of the Grecian emperors, in this respect, has never been contested; and though the partisans of the Roman pontiffs endeavour to render dubious the supremacy of the Latin monarchs over the church, yet this supremacy is too manifest to be disputed by such as have considered

The authority of the Roman pontiffs limited by, and subordinate to, that of the emperors.

[g] See, for an account of CHRODEGANGUS, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 128. CALMET, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 513. *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. Martii, p. 452. The rule which he prescribed to his *canons*, may be seen in LE COINTE'S *Annales Francor. Eccles.* tom. v. ad A. 757, § 35; as also in the *Concilia Labbei*, tom. vii. 1444. He is not, however, the author of the rule which is published in his name, in the *Spicilegium Veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 565. LONGUEVAL, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. iv. p. 435. has given a neat and elegant abridgement of the rule of CHRODEGANGUS.

[b] See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Antiq. Italicor. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 185; as also LUD. THOMASSIN. *Disciplina Ecclesie Vet. et Nov.* part. i. lib. iii. The design of this institution was truly excellent. The authors of it justly shocked at the vicious manners of a licentious clergy, hoped that this new institution would have a tendency to prevent the irregularities of that order, by delivering them from the cares, anxieties, and occupations of this present life. But the event has shewn how much these pious hopes have been disappointed.

CENT.
VIII.

the matter attentively [i], and it is acknowledged by the wisest and most candid writers even of the Romish communion. ADRIAN I, in a council of bishops assembled at *Rome*, conferred upon CHARLEMAGNE, and his successors, the right of election to the see of *Rome* [k]; and though neither CHARLEMAGNE, nor his son LEWIS, were willing to exercise this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontiff upon every vacancy, yet they reserved the right of approving and confirming the person that was elected to that high dignity by the priests and people: nor was the consecration of the elected pontiff of the least validity, unless performed in presence of the emperor's ambassadors [l]. The Roman pontiffs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial decisions, as of indispensable obligation, and executed them with the utmost punctuality and submission [m]. The kings of the Franks appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called *envoys* to inspect into the lives and manners of the clergy superior and inferior, to take cognizance of their contests, to terminate their disputes, to enact laws concerning the public worship, and to punish the crimes of the sacred order, as well as those of the other citizens [n]. All churches also, and monasteries, were obliged to pay to the public treasury a tribute proportioned to their respective lands and possessions, except such as, by the pure favour of the su-

[i] For an accurate account of the rights of the Grecian emperors in religious matters, we refer the reader to LE QUIENS, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 136.

[k] This *Ad* is mentioned by ANASTASIUS: it has been preserved by YVO and GRATIAN, and has been the subject of a multitude of treatises.

[l] See MABILLON, *Comm. in Ordinem Romanum, Musei Italici*, tom. ii. p. 113. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, p. 87.

[m] This has been amply demonstrated by BALUZIUS, in his *Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francorum*, § 21.

[n] See MURATORI *Antiq. Italic. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. Diff. ix. p. 470. FRANC. de ROYE *De Missis Dominicis*, cap. x. p. 44. cap. viii. p. 118 134. 168. 195.

preme

Chap.

premi
neral

XV

not
churc
that
ledge
the t
tical
was
nothi
vene
be te
the p
decisi
own
bisho
upon
positi
Rom
in th
in or
cerni
be ob
the r
the e
these
coun
prov

[o]

926.

on oc
to the
the H
title:

[p]

cap. iv

[q]

his pr

is also

de l'E

preme powers, were graciously exempted from this general tax [o].

CENT.
VIII.

XVI. It is true, indeed, that the Latin emperors did not assume to themselves the administration of the church, or the cognizance and decision of controversies that were purely of a religious nature. They acknowledged, on the contrary, that these matters belonged to the tribunal of the Roman pontiff and of the ecclesiastical councils [p]. But this jurisdiction of the pontiff was confined within narrow limits; he could decide nothing by his sole authority, but was obliged to convene a council when any religious differences were to be terminated by an authoritative judgment. Nor did the provinces, when any controversy arose, wait for the decision of the bishop of *Rome*; but assembled, by their own authority, their particular councils, in which the bishops gave their thoughts, with the utmost freedom, upon the points in debate, and voted often in direct opposition to what was known to be the opinion of the Roman pontiff; all which is evident from what passed in the councils assembled by the Franks and Germans, in order to determine the celebrated controversy concerning the use and worship of images. It is further to be observed, that the power of convening councils, and the right of presiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and sovereign princes, in whose dominions these assemblies were held; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws, until they were approved and confirmed by the supreme magistrate [q].

Confined
within nar-
row limits.

[o] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. Diss. xvii. p. 926. See also the collection of the various pieces that were published on occasion of the dispute between LEWIS XV. and his clergy, relating to the immunities of that Order in *France*. These pieces were printed at the *Hague* in the year 1751, in seven volumes 8v°, under the following title: *Écrits pour et contre les immunités prétendues par le Clergé de France*.

[p] See the Dissertation of CHARLEMAGNE, *De imaginibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 48. edit. Heumann.

[q] All this is fully and admirably demonstrated by BALUZIUS, in his preface to the *Capitularia*, or laws of the kings of the Franks, and is also amply illustrated in that work. See also J. BASNAGE, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 270.

Thus

CENT.
VIII.

Thus was the spiritual authority of *Rome* wisely bounded by the civil power; but its ambitious pontiffs, fretted under the imperial curb, and eager to break loose their bonds, left no means unemployed for that purpose. Nay, they formed projects which seemed less the effects of ambition than of frenzy; for they claimed a supreme dominion, not only over the church, but also over kings themselves, and pretended to reduce the whole universe under their ghostly jurisdiction. However extravagant these pretensions were, they were followed by the most vigorous efforts, and the wars and tumults that arose in the following century, contributed much to render these efforts successful.

Grecian and
eastern writers.

XVII. If we turn our eyes towards the writers of this century, we shall find very few that stand distinguished in the lists of fame, either on account of erudition or genius. Among the Greeks, the following only seem worthy of mention.

GERMANUS, bishop of *Constantinople*, the greatest part of whose high renown was due to his violent zeal for image-worship [r].

COSMAS, bishop of *Jerusalem*, who acquired some reputation by his Lyric vein, consecrated to the service of religion, and employed in composing hymns for public and private devotion.

GEORGE SYNCELLUS and THEOPHANES, who are not the least considerable among the writers of the Byzantine history, though they be in all respects infinitely below the ancient Greek and Latin Historians.

But the writer, who surpassed all his contemporaries among the Greeks and Orientals, was JOHN DAMASCENUS, a man of genius and eloquence, who, in a variety of productions full of erudition, explained the Peripatetic philosophy, and illustrated the main and capital points of the Christian doctrine. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the eminent talents of this

[r] See RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiastique de M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 270.

great man were tainted with that sordid superstition, C B N T.
VIII. and that excessive veneration for the ancient fathers, that were the reigning defects of the age he lived in, not to mention his wretched method of explaining the doctrines of the gospel according to the principles of the Aristotelian philosophy [s].

XVIII. The first place among the Latin writers is due to CHARLEMAGNE, whose love of letters was one of the bright ornaments of his imperial dignity. The laws which are known by the title of *Capitularia*, with several *Epistles*, and a *Book concerning images*, are attributed to this prince; though it seems highly probable, that the most of these compositions were drawn up by other pens [t]. Western and
Latin writers.

After this learned prince, we may justly place venerable BEDE, so called from his illustrious virtues [u]; ALCUIN [w], the preceptor of CHARLEMAGNE; PAULINUS of *Aquileia* [x] who were all distinguished by their laborious application, and their zeal for the advancement of learning and science, and who treated the various branches of literature, that were known in this century, in such a manner as to convince us, that it was the infelicity of the times, rather than the want of genius, that hindered them from arising to higher degrees of perfection than what they attained to. Add to these BONIFACE, of whom we have already spoken;

[s] BAYLE *Diction.* tom. ii. p. 950; as also the account of the writings of JOHN DAMASCENUS, which is published in LE QUIEN's edition of his works, and was composed by LEO ALLATIUS.

[t] See JO. A. FABRICII *Bibliotheca medii ævi Lat.* tom. i. p. 936. *Histoire Littéraire de France*, tom. iv. p. 378.

[u] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. April. p. 866. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article of BEDE. A list of the writings of this venerable Briton, composed by himself, is published by MURATORI, in his *Antiq. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 825.

[w] *Hist. Littér. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 295. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article ALCUIN. CATELINOT, who has discovered the treatise of ALCUIN, *De Processione Spiritus S.* which has never been published, is preparing an edition of all the works of that learned writer. See the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. viii. *Præf.* p. 10.

[x] See *Hist. Littéraire*, &c. tom. iv. p. 286. *Acta Sanct.* tom. i. *Januar.* p. 713.

CENT.
VIII.

EGINARD, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, and other productions; PAUL, the deacon, who acquired a considerable and lasting reputation by his *History of the Lombards*, his *Book of Homilies*, and his miscellaneous labours; AMBROSE AUTHPERT, who wrote a commentary on the *Revelations*; and THEODULPHUS bishop of *Orléans*; and thus we shall have a complete list of all the writers who acquired any degree of esteem in this century, by their literary productions, either sacred or profane.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church in this century.

The Christian doctrine
sadly corrupted.

I. **T**HE fundamental doctrines of Christianity were, as yet, respected and preserved in the theological writings both of the Greeks and Latins, as seems evident from the discourse of JOHN DAMASCENUS, *concerning the orthodox faith*, and the confession of faith which was drawn up by CHARLEMAGNE [y]. The pure seed of celestial truth was, however, choaked by a monstrous and incredible quantity of noxious weeds. The rational simplicity of the Christian worship was corrupted by an idolatrous veneration for images, and other superstitious inventions, and the sacred flame of divine charity was extinguished by the violent contentions and animosities, which the progress of these superstitions occasioned in the church. All acknowledged the efficacy of our Saviour's merits: and yet all, one way or other, laboured, in effect, to diminish the persuasiveness

[y] See the treatise of this prince, *Concerning images*, book III. p. 259. ed. Heumanni. Of the Greek writers, the reader may consult MICH. SYNCELLUS, his *Confession of faith*, published by MONTFAUCON, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 90; and among the Latins, *An exposition of the principal doctrine of the Christian religion*, composed by BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, and published by BALUZIUS, in his *Miscellanea*, tom. v. p. 56; as also the *Creed of Leo III.*, published in the same work, tom. vii. p. 18.

on of this efficacy in the minds of men, by teaching that C E N T.
 Christians might appease an offended deity by voluntary VIII.
 acts of mortification, or by gifts and oblations lavished
 upon the church, and by exhorting such as were desi-
 rous of salvation to place their confidence in the works
 and merits of the saints. Were we to enlarge upon all
 the absurdities and superstitions which were invented to
 flatter the passions of the misguided multitude, and to
 increase, at the expence of reason and Christianity, the
 opulence and authority of a licentious clergy; such an
 immense quantity of odious materials would swell this
 work to an enormous size.

II. The piety in vogue during this and some suc- The piety
 ceeding ages consisted in building, and embellishing and morals
 churches and chapels, in endowing monasteries, erect- of this age.
 ing basilics, hunting after the relicks of saints and mar-
 tyrs, and treating them with an excessive and absurd
 veneration, in procuring the intercession of the saints by
 rich oblations or superstitious rites, in worshipping ima-
 ges, in pilgrimages to those places which were esteemed
 holy, and chiefly to *Palestine*, and such like absurd and
 extravagant practices and institutions. The pious
 Christian, and the profligate transgressor, shewed equal
 zeal in the performance of these superstitious services,
 which were looked upon as of the highest efficacy in or-
 der to the attainment of eternal salvation; they were
 performed by the latter as an expiation for their crimes,
 and a mean of appeasing an offended deity; and by
 the former with a view to obtain, from above, the
 good things of this life, and an easy and commodious
 passage to life eternal. The true and genuine religion
 of *JESUS*, if we except a few of its doctrines contained
 in the *Creed*, was utterly unknown in this century, not
 only to the multitude in general, but also to the doc-
 tors of the first rank and eminence in the church, and
 the consequences of this corrupt ignorance were fatal
 to the interests of virtue. All orders of men, regardless
 of the obligations of morality, of the duties of the gos-
 pel, and of the culture and improvement of their minds,
 rushed headlong with a perfect security into all sorts of
 wicked-

CENT.
VIII.

wickedness, from the delusive hopes, that by the intercession and prayers of the saints, and the credit of the priests at the throne of God, they would easily obtain the remission of their enormities, and render the deity propitious. This dismal account of the religion and morals of the eighth century, is confirmed by the unanimous testimony of all the historians who have written concerning that period.

Exegetical
or explanatory
theology.

III. The Greeks were of opinion, that the holy scriptures had been successfully interpreted and explained by the ancient commentators, and therefore imagined, that they rendered a most important service to the students in divinity, when, without either judgment or choice, they extracted and compiled from the works of these admired sages their explanatory observations on the sacred writings. The commentary of JOHN DAMASCENUS, upon the epistles of St. PAUL, which was taken from the writings of CHRYSOSTOM, is alone sufficient to serve as a proof of the little discernment with which these compilations were generally made.

The Latin expositors may be divided into two classes, according to the different nature of their productions. In the first, we place those writers who, after the example of the Greeks, employed their labour in collecting into one body the interpretations and commentaries of the ancients. BEDE distinguished himself among the expositors of this class by his explication of the epistles of St. PAUL, drawn from the writings of AUGUSTIN and others [z]. Still more estimable are the writers of the second class, who made use of their own penetration and sagacity in investigating the sense of the holy scriptures, such as ALCUIN, AMBROSE AUTHPERT, the expositors of the *Revelations*, nay and BEDE also, who belongs, in reality, to both classes. It must, however, be acknowledged, that all these commentators were

[z] See, for an account of the commentaries of BEDE, RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. de M. DU PIN*, tom. i. p. 280. See also BEDE *Explicatio Geneseos ex patribus* in MARTENE'S *Thesaur. Anecdor.* tom. v. p. 111. 116. 140. and his interpretation of *Habakkuk*, *ibid.* p. 295.

destitute of the qualities that are essential to the sacred critic; for we find them in their explications neglecting entirely the natural sense of the words of scripture, and running blind-fold after a certain hidden and mystical meaning, which, to use their jargon, they usually divide into *allegorical*, *anagogical*, and *tropological* [a]; and thus delivering their own rash fictions and crude fancies, as the true and genuine sentiments of the sacred writers. Of this we are furnished with many examples in *ALCUIN's commentary on St. John*; *BEDE's allegorical illustrations of the books of Samuel*; and *CHARLEMAGNE's book concerning images*, in which various passages of the holy scriptures are occasionally explained according to the taste of the times [b].

IV. The veneration of CHARLEMAGNE for the sacred writings was carried to such an excessive length [c], as to persuade that monarch, that they contained the latent seeds and principles of all arts and sciences; an opinion, no doubt, which he early imbibed from the lessons of his preceptor *ALCUIN*, and the other divines who frequented his court [d]. Hence the zeal with which that prince excited and encouraged the more learned among the clergy, to direct their pious labours towards the illustration of the holy scriptures. Several laws which he published to encourage this species of learning are yet extant, as also various monuments of his deep sollicitude about the advancement and propagation of Christian knowledge [e]. And lest the faults that were to be found in several places of the Latin translation of the scriptures should prove an obstacle to the execution and accomplishment of his pious views, he employed *ALCUIN* in correcting these errors, and is said, in the last years of his life, to have spent a consi-

Charle-
magne's zeal
for the study
of the scrip-
tures.

[a] See *CAROLUS Magnus de Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 138.

[b] See the same imperial author, book I. p. 84. 91. 123. 127. 131. 133. 136. 138. 145. 160. 164. 165, &c.

[c] Id. *De Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 231. 236.

[d] *JO. FRICKIUS De Canone Scripturæ Sacræ*, p. 184.

[e] *BARONIUS Annal. ad A. DCCLXXVIII. n. XXVII.* *JO A. FABRICIUS Biblioth. Lat. medii ævii*, tom. i. p. 950. *JAC. USSERIUS, De sacris et scripturis vernacul.* p. 119.

CENT.
VIII.

derable part of his time in the same learned and pious work [f]. It is also to his encouragement and direction, that some writers attribute the first German translation of the sacred writings, though others contend, that this honour is due to his son and successor LEWIS, surnamed the MEEK.

Misses its
aim, by some
imprudent
appointments
of that em-
peror.

V. This zeal and industry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouse from their sloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raise up a spirit of application to literary pursuits. We cannot, however, help observing, that this laborious prince imprudently established certain customs, and confirmed others, which had a manifest tendency to defeat, in a great measure, his laudable designs of promoting Christian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in use, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public assemblies, certain portions only of the scriptures; and reduced the different methods of worship followed in different churches into one fixed rule, which was to be observed with the most perfect uniformity in all [g]. Persuaded also that few

[f] J. A. FABRICII *Bibl. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. USSERIUS, *De sacris et scripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

[g] They who imagine that the portions of scripture which are still explained, every year, to Christians in their religious assemblies, were selected for that purpose by the order of CHARLEMAGNE, are undoubtedly mistaken; since it is manifest, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of scripture set apart for each day of worship in the greatest part of the Latin churches. See JO. HENR. THAMERUS *Schediasma de origine et dignitate pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epistolæ vulgo vocantur.* See also J. FRANC. BUDDEI *Isagoge ad Theologiam* tom. ii. p. 1640. It must, however, be confessed, that CHARLEMAGNE introduced some new regulations into this part of divine service; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in several circumstances of the public worship, and particularly in this, that the same portions of scripture were not read and explained in them all, he published a solemn edict, commanding all the religious assemblies within his territories to conform themselves to the rule of worship and divine service established in the church of Rome. With respect to the portions of scripture, which we call the *epistles* and *gospels*, and which, from the time of CHARLEMAGNE down to us, continue to be used in divine worship, it is certain that they were read in the church of Rome so early as the sixth century. It is also certain, that this prince

of the clergy were capable of explaining with perspicuity and judgment the portions of scripture, which are distinguished in the ritual by the name of epistle and gospel; he ordered PAUL DEACON, and ALCUIN to compile, from the ancient doctors of the church, *homilies*, or discourses upon the epistles and gospels, which a stupid and ignorant set of priests were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave rise to that famous collection, which went by the title of the *homiliarium of Charlemagne* [b], and which being followed as a model by many productions of the same kind composed by private persons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nourish the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthless clergy [i]. The zeal and activity of this great prince did not stop here ;

was extremely careful in reforming the service of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worship used at Rome to be observed in them all. Hence the churches, which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different *epistles* and *gospels* from those which are used by us and the other western churches, who were commanded by CHARLEMAGNE to imitate the Roman service. The church of Corbetta is an example of this, as may be seen in MURATORI'S *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 836; and also the church of Milan, which follows the rite of St. AMBROSE. If any are desirous to know what *epistles* and *gospels* were used by the Franks and other western churches before the time of CHARLEMAGNE, they have only to consult the *Calendars* published by MARTENE, in his *Thesaur.* tom. v. p. 66. the *Discourses* of BEDE, published in the same work, tom. i. p. 339. and MABILLON, *De Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana* ; to all which may be added PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle du Roi de France*, p. 566.

[b] See, for an account of this book of *Homilies*, the learned SEELEN'S *Selecta Litteraria*, p. 252.

[i] ALAN, abbot of Farfa in Italy, wrote in this century an enormous *Book of Homilies*, the Preface to which is published by BERNARD PEZIUS, in the *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. vi. part. i. p. 83. In the following age several works under the same title were composed by learned men ; one by HAGMO, of Halberstadt, which is still extant ; another by RABANUS MAURUS, at the request of the emperor LOTHAIRE ; and a third by HERICUS, mentioned by PEZIUS in the work above quoted, p. 93. All these were wrote in Latin. The famous OTTFRID, of Weissenbourg, was the first who composed a *Book of Homilies* in the Teutonic language ; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, see LAMBECIUS, *De Bibliotheca Vindobon. Augusta*, tom. ii. cap. v. p. 419.

CENT.
VIII.

derable part of his time in the same learned and pious work [f]. It is also to his encouragement and direction, that some writers attribute the first German translation of the sacred writings, though others contend, that this honour is due to his son and successor LEWIS, surnamed the MEEK.

Misses its
aim, by some
imprudent
appointments
of that em-
peror.

V. This zeal and industry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouse from their sloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raise up a spirit of application to literary pursuits. We cannot, however, help observing, that this laborious prince imprudently established certain customs, and confirmed others, which had a manifest tendency to defeat, in a great measure, his laudable designs of promoting Christian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in use, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public assemblies, certain portions only of the scriptures; and reduced the different methods of worship followed in different churches into one fixed rule, which was to be observed with the most perfect uniformity in all [g]. Persuaded also that few

[f] J. A. FABRICII *Bibl. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. USSE-RIUS, *De sacris et scripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

[g] They who imagine that the portions of scripture which are still explained, every year, to Christians in their religious assemblies, were selected for that purpose by the order of CHARLEMAGNE, are undoubtedly mistaken; since it is manifest, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of scripture set apart for each day of worship in the greatest part of the Latin churches. See JO. HENR. THAMER *Schediasma de origine et dignitate pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epistolæ vulgo vocantur.* See also J. FRANC. BUDDEI *Isagoge ad Theologiam* tom. ii. p. 1640. It must, however, be confessed, that CHARLEMAGNE introduced some new regulations into this part of divine service; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in several circumstances of the public worship, and particularly in this, that the same portions of scripture were not read and explained in them all, he published a solemn edict, commanding all the religious assemblies within his territories to conform themselves to the rule of worship and divine service established in the church of Rome. With respect to the portions of scripture, which we call the *epistles* and *gospels*, and which, from the time of CHARLEMAGNE down to us, continue to be used in divine worship, it is certain that they were read in the church of Rome so early as the sixth century. It is also certain, that this prince

of the clergy were capable of explaining with perspicuity and judgment the portions of scripture, which are distinguished in the ritual by the name of epistle and gospel; he ordered PAUL DEACON, and ALCUIN to compile, from the ancient doctors of the church, *homilies*, or discourses upon the epistles and gospels, which a stupid and ignorant set of priests were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave rise to that famous collection, which went by the title of the *homiliarium of Charlemagne* [b], and which being followed as a model by many productions of the same kind composed by private persons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nourish the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthless clergy [i]. The zeal and activity of this great prince did not stop here ;

was extremely careful in reforming the service of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worship used at Rome to be observed in them all. Hence the churches, which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different *epistles* and *gospels* from those which are used by us and the other western churches, who were commanded by CHARLEMAGNE to imitate the Roman service. The church of *Corbetta* is an example of this, as may be seen in MURATORI'S *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 836; and also the church of *Milan*, which follows the rite of St. AMBROSE. If any are desirous to know what *epistles* and *gospels* were used by the Franks and other western churches before the time of CHARLEMAGNE, they have only to consult the *Calendars* published by MARTENE, in his *Thesaur.* tom. v. p. 66. the *Discourses* of BEDE, published in the same work, tom. v. p. 339. and MABILLON, *De Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana* ; to all which may be added PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle du Roi de France*, p. 566.

[b] See, for an account of this book of *Homilies*, the learned SEELEN'S *Selecta Litteraria*, p. 252.

[i] ALAN, abbot of *Farfa* in Italy, wrote in this century an enormous *Book of Homilies*, the Preface to which is published by BERNARD PEZIUS, in the *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. vi. part. i. p. 83. In the following age several works under the same title were composed by learned men ; one by HAGMO, of *Halberstadt*, which is still extant ; another by RABANUS MAURUS at the request of the emperor LOTHAIRE ; and a third by HERICUS, mentioned by PEZIUS in the work above quoted, p. 93. All these were wrote in Latin. The famous OTTFRID, of *Weissenbourg*, was the first who composed a *Book of Homilies* in the Teutonic language ; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, see LAMBECIUS, *De Bibliotheca Vindobon. Augusta*, tom. ii. cap. v. p. 49.

for he ordered the lives of the principal saints, to be written in a moderate volume, of which copies were dispersed throughout his dominions, that the people might have in the dead, examples of piety and virtue, which were no where to be found among the living. All these projects and designs were certainly formed and executed with upright and pious intentions, and, considering the state of things in this century, were, in several respects, both useful and necessary; they, however, contrary to the emperor's intention, contributed, undoubtedly, to encourage the priests in their criminal sloth, and their shameful neglect of the study of the scriptures. For the greatest part of them employed their time and labour only upon those parts of the sacred writings, which the emperor had appointed to be read in the churches and explained to the people; and never attempted to exercise their capacities upon the rest of the divine word. The greatest part of the clergy also, instead of composing themselves the discourses they recited in public, confined themselves to their books of homilies, that was published by the authority of their sovereign, and thus let their talents lie uncultivated and unemployed.

The state of
diadecmic
theology.

VI. None of the Latins carried their theological enterprizes so far as to give a complete, connected, and accurate system of the various doctrines of Christianity. It would be absurd to comprehend under this title the various discourses concerning the person and nature of CHRIST, which were designed to refute the errors of FELIX [k] and ELIPAND, or to combat the opinions, which were now spread abroad concerning the origin of the Holy Ghost [l], and several other points; since these discourses afford no proofs either of precision or

[(k)] The doctrine taught by FELIX, bishop of *Urgella*, and his disciple ELIPAND, archbishop of *Toledo*, was, that JESUS CHRIST was the son of God not by *nature*, but by *adoption*. This doctrine was also intimately connected with the Nestorian hypothesis, and was condemned in this century, by the synod of *Ratisbon*, and the councils of *Frankfort*, and *Frioul*.]

[(l)] The error now published relating to the *Holy Ghost* was, that it proceeded from the father *only*, and not from the father and the son.]

diligence

diligence in their authors. The labours and industry of the divines of this age were totally employed in collecting the opinions and authorities of the *fathers*, by whom are meant the theological writers of the first six centuries; and so blind and servile was their veneration for these doctors, that they regarded their dictates as infallible, and their writings as the boundaries of truth, beyond which reason was not permitted to push its researches. The Irish or Hibernians, who in this century were known by the name of *Scots*, were the only divines who refused to dishonour their reason by submitting it implicitly to the dictates of authority. Naturally subtle and sagacious, they applied their philosophy, such as it was, to the illustration of the truths and doctrines of religion; a method which was almost generally abhorred and exploded in all other nations [*m*].

The

[*m*] That the Hibernians, who were called *Scots* in this century, were lovers of learning, and distinguished themselves, in those times of ignorance, by the culture of the sciences beyond all the other European nations, travelling through the most distant lands both with a view to improve and to communicate their knowledge, is a fact with which I have long been acquainted, as we see them, in the most authentic records of antiquity, discharging, with the highest reputation and applause, the function of doctors in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, both during this and the following century. But that these Hibernians were the first teachers of the *scholastic theology* in *Europe*, and so early as the eighth century illustrated the doctrines of religion by the principles of philosophy, I learned but lately from the testimony of BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in the province of *Languedoc*, who lived in this period, and some of whose productions are published by BALUZIUS, in the fifth volume of his *Miscellanea*. This learned abbot, in his *Letter to Guarnanius*, p. 54. expresses himself thus: "Apud modernos scholasticos (*i. e.* public teachers, or school-masters) maxime apud SCOTOS est syllogismus delusionis; ut dicant, Trinitatem, sicut personarum, ita esse substantiarum;" (by this it appears, that the Irish divines made use of a certain syllogism, which BENEDICT calls *delusive*, *i. e.* fallacious and sophistical, to demonstrate that the *persons* in the God-head were *substances*: a capacious follygism this, as we may see from what follows, and also every way proper to throw the ignorant into the greatest perplexity) "quatinus si adtulerit illectus auditor, Trinitatem esse trium substantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum: si autem abnuerit, personarum denegatur culpatur." It was with this miserable piece of sophistry, that these subtle divines puzzled and tormented their disciples

CENT.
VIII.

The Greeks were not so destitute of systematical divines as the Latins. JOHN DAMASCENUS composed a complete body of the Christian doctrine in a scientific method, under the title of *Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith*. The two kinds of *Theology*, which the Latins termed *scholastic* and *didactic*, were united in this laborious performance, in which the author not only explains the doctrines he delivers by subtle and profound reasoning, but also confirms his explications by the authority of the ancient doctors. This book was received among the Greeks with the highest applause, and was so excessively admired, that at length it came to be acknowledged among that people as the only rule of divine truth. Many, however, complain of this applauded writer, as having consulted more, in his theological system, the conjectures of human reason, and the opinions of the ancients, than the genuine dictates of the sacred oracles, and of having, in consequence of this method, deviated from the true source and the essential principles of theology [n]. To the work of DAMASCENUS now mentioned we may add his *Sacred Parallels*, in which he has collected, with uncommon care and industry, the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning the various points of the Christian religion.

and hearers, accusing those of *Tritheism*, who admitted their argument, and casting the reproach of *Sabellianism* upon those who rejected it. For thus they reasoned, or rather quibbled; "You must either affirm or deny that the Three Persons in the Deity are Three Substances. If you affirm it, you are undoubtedly a *Tritheite*, and worship Three Gods: if you deny it, this denial implies that they are not three distinct persons, and thus you fall into *Sabellianism*." BENEDICT condemns this Hibernian subtilty, and severely animadverts upon the introduction of it into theology; he also recommends in its place that amiable simplicity that is so conformable to the nature and genius of the gospel: "Sed hæc de fide (says he) et omnis callidatis versutia simplicitate fidei catholicæ est puritate vitanda, non captiosa interjectione linguarum, scæva impactione interpolanda." From hence it appears, that the philosophical or scholastic theology among the Latins is of more ancient date than is commonly imagined.

[n] JO. HENR. HOTTINGER. *Bibliothecar. Quadripart. lib. iii. cap. ii. § 3. p. 372.* MART. CHEMNITIUS, *De usu et utilitate Locor. Commun. p. 26.*

We

We may, therefore, look upon this writer as the C E N T.
VIII. THOMAS and LOMBARD of the Greeks.

VII. None of the moral writers of this century attempted forming a complete system of the duties and Moral writers virtues of the Christian life. JOHN, surnamed CARPATHIUS, a Greek writer, composed some *exhortatory discourses*, in which there are scarcely any marks of judgment or genius. Among the monastic orders nothing was relished, but the enthusiastic strains of the Mystics, and the doctrines of DIONYSIUS the Areopagite, their pretended chief, whose supposititious writings were interpreted and explained by JOHANNES DARENSIS out of complaisance to the monks [o]. The Latin writers confined their labours in morality to some general precepts concerning virtue and vice, that seemed rather destined to regulate the external actions of Christians, than to purify their inward principles, or to fix duty upon its proper foundations. Their precepts also, such as they were, and their manner of explaining them, had now imbibed a strong tincture of the Peripatetic philosophy, as appears from certain treatises of BEDE, and the *treatise* of ALCUIN, *concerning virtue and vice* [p]. That the people, however, might be animated to the pursuit of virtue by the commanding power of example, BEDE, FLORUS, ALCUIN, MARCELLINUS, AMBROSE, AUTHPERT, and others employed their pious industry in writing the lives of such as had been eminent for their piety, and worthy deeds.

VIII. The controversies, that turned upon the main Controversies. and essential points of religion were, during this century, few in number, and scarcely any of them managed with tolerable sagacity or judgment. The greatest part of the Greeks were involved in the dispute concerning images, in which their reasonings were utterly destitute of precision and perspicuity; while the Latins employed their chief zeal and industry in confuting and extirpa-

[o] JOS. SIMON ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 129.

[p] This treatise is extant in the works of ALCUIN, published by QUERCETANUS, tom. ii. p. 1218.

CENT.
VIII.

ting the doctrine of ELIPAND concerning the person of CHRIST. JOHN DAMASCENUS exposed the errors of all the different sects in a short, but useful and interesting, treatise; he also attacked the Manichæans and Nestorians with a particular vehemence, and even went so far in his polemic labours as to combat the erroneous doctrine of the Saracens. In these compositions we find several proofs of subtilty and genius, but very little of that clearness and simplicity that constitute the chief merit of polemic writings. The Jews were left almost unmolested, as the Christians were sufficiently employed by the controversies that had arisen among themselves: ANASTASIUS, abbot of *Palestine*, made, however, some attempts to subdue the infidelity of that obstinate people.

The origin
of the dis-
pute concern-
ing the
worship of
images.

IX. Of all the controversies which agitated and perplexed the Christian church during this century, that which arose concerning the worship of images in *Greece*, and was carried from thence into both the eastern and western provinces, was the most unhappy and pernicious in its consequences. The first sparks of this terrible flame, that had like to have proved fatal both to the interests of religion and government, had already appeared under the reign of PHILIPPICUS BARDANES, who was created emperor of the Greeks a little after the commencement of this century. This prince, with the consent of JOHN patriarch of *Constantinople*, ordered a picture, which represented the sixth general council, to be pulled down from its place in the church of *St. Sophia*, A. D. 712; because this council had condemned the Monothelites, whose cause the emperor espoused with the greatest ardor and vehemence. Nor did BARDANES stop here; but sent immediately an order to *Rome* to remove all images of that nature from the churches and other places of worship. His orders, however, were far from being received with submission, or producing their designed effect; on the contrary, CONSTANTINE, the Roman pontiff, not only rejected, by a formal protest, the imperial edict, but, resolved to express his contempt of it by his actions as well as

his

his words; he ordered six pictures, representing the C E N T.
 six general councils, to be placed in the porch of *St. Peter's* church; and, that no act of rebellion or arro- VIII.
 gance might be left unemployed, he assembled a council at *Rome*, in which he caused the emperor himself to be condemned as an apostate from the true religion. These first tumults were quelled by a revolution, which, the year following, deprived *BARDANES* of the imperial throne [q].

X. The dispute, however, broke out with redoubled fury under *LEO* the *Isaurian*, a prince of the greatest resolution and intrepidity, and the new tumults it excited were both violent and durable. *LEO*, unable to bear any longer the excessive height to which the Greeks carried their superstitious attachment to the worship of images, and the sharp railleries and serious reproaches, which this idolatrous service drew upon the Christians from the Jews and Saracens, determined, by the most vigorous proceedings, to root out at once this growing evil. For this purpose he issued out an edict, A. D. 726, by which it was ordered, not only that the worship of images should be abrogated and relinquished, but also that all the images, except that of *CHRIST's* crucifixion, should be removed out of the churches [r]. In this proceeding the emperor acted more from the impulse of his natural character, which

Its progress
under Leo
the Isaurian.

[q] See *FRED. SPANHEMII Historia imaginum restituta*, which is published in the second volume of his works, and also printed apart. *MAIMBOURG's* History of this controversy, which is full of the most absurd and malignant fictions. *MURATORI Annali d' Italia*, tom. iv. p. 221.

[(r) In this account of the imperial edict, *Dr. MOSHEIM* follows the opinions of *BARONIUS*, *FLEURY*, and *LE SUEUR*. Others affirm, with more probability, that this famous edict did not enjoin the pulling down images every where and casting them out of the churches, but only prohibited the paying to them any kind of adoration or worship. It would seem as if *LEO* was not, at first, averse to the use of images, as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and memory; for at the same time that he forbid them to be worshipped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, say some, to avoid this adoration; but afterwards finding that they were the occasion of idolatry, he had them removed from the churches and broken.]

CEN T. was warm and vehement, than from the dictates of
VIII. prudence, which avoids principitancy where prejudices are to be combated, and destroys and mines inveterate superstitions rather by slow and imperceptible attacks, than by open and violent assaults. The imperial edict produced such effects, as might have been expected from the frantic enthusiasm of a superstitious people. A civil war broke out in the islands of the Archipelago, ravaged a part of *Asia*, and afterwards reached *Italy*. The people, partly from their own ignorance, but principally in consequence of the perfidious suggestions of the priests and monks, who had artfully rendered the worship of images a source of opulence to their churches and cloisters, were led to regard the emperor as an apostate, and hence they considered themselves as freed from their oath of allegiance, and from all the obligations that attach subjects to their lawful sovereign.

The contests
 between the
 partisans of
 images, who
 were called
Iconoduli,
 and their op-
 posers, who
 were called
Iconoclastæ.

XI. The Roman pontiffs GREGORY I and II were the authors and ring-leaders of these civil commotions and insurrections in *Italy*. The former, upon the emperor's refusing to revoke his edict against images, declared him, without hesitation, unworthy of the name and privileges of a Christian, and thus excluded him from the communion of the church; and no sooner was this formidable sentence made public, than the Romans, and other Italian provinces, that were subject to the Grecian empire, violated their allegiance, and rising in arms either massacred or banished all the emperor's deputies and officers. LEO exasperated by these insolent proceedings, resolved to chastise the Italian rebels, and to make the haughty pontiff feel, in a particular manner, the effects of his resentment; but he failed in the attempt. Doubly irritated by this disappointment, he vented his fury against images, and their worshippers, in the year 730, in a much more terrible manner than he had hitherto done; for, in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, he degraded from his office GERMANUS, the bishop of that imperial city, who was a patron of images, put ANASTASIUS in his place, or-
 dered

Chap
 dered
 varie
 ed t
 divid
 whos
 and p
 and a
 adora
 coun
 main
 noth
 to de
 were
 and
 mach
 GOR
 stitic
 even
 of th
 are
 that
 lates
 was
 worl
 Grec

[s]
 their
 TIME
 peopl
 tribu
 ence.
 the I
 and t
 ters,
 of th
 muni
 their
 p. 45
 Eccle
 cordi
 ratio
 GIA
 their

dered all the images to be publicly burnt, and inflicted a variety of severe punishments upon such as were attached to that idolatrous worship. These rigorous measures divided the Christian church into two violent factions, whose contests were carried on with ungovernable rage, and produced nothing but mutual invectives, crimes, and assassinations. Of these factions the one adopted the adoration and worship of images, and were on that account called *Iconoduli* or *Iconolatæ*; while the other maintained that such worship was unlawful, and that nothing was more worthy of the zeal of Christians than to demolish and destroy those statues and pictures, that were the occasions and objects of this gross idolatry, and hence they were distinguished by the titles of *Iconomachi* and *Iconoclastæ*. The furious zeal, which GREGORY II had shewn in the defending the odious superstition of image-worship, was not only imitated, but even surpassed by his successor, who was the III pontiff of that time; and though, at this distance of time, we are not acquainted with all the criminal circumstances that attended the intemperate zeal of these insolent prelates, yet we know with the utmost certainty, that it was owing to their extravagant attachment to image-worship that the Italian provinces were torn from the Grecian empire [s].

XII.

[s] The Greek writers tell us, that both the GREGORIES, carried their insolence so far as to excommunicate LEO and his son CONSTANTINE, to dissolve the obligation of the oath of allegiance, which the people of *Italy* had taken to those princes, and to prohibit their paying tribute to them, or shewing them any marks of submission and obedience. These facts are also acknowledged by many of the partisans of the Roman pontiffs, such as BARONIUS, SIGONIUS *De Regno Italiæ*, and their numerous followers. On the other hand, some learned writers, particularly among the French, alleviate considerably the crime of the GREGORIES, and positively deny that they either excommunicated the emperors abovementioned, or called off the people from their duty and allegiance. See LAUNOIUS, *Epistolar.* lib. vii. *Ep.* vii. p. 456. tom. v. *Opp.* part. II. NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Select. Histor. Ecclesiast. Capit.* sæc. viii. *Dissert.* i. p. 456. PETR. de MARCA, *Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. iii. cap. xi. BOSSUET, *Defens. Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de potestate Ecclesiæ.* part. I. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 197. GIANNONE, *Histoire Civile de Naples*, tom. i. p. 400. All these found their opinions, concerning the conduct of the GREGORIES, chiefly upon the

CENT.
VIII.

Their progress under
Constantine
Copronymus.

XII. CONSTANTINE, to whom the furious tribe of the image-worshippers had given by way of derision the name of COPRONYMUS [1], succeeded his father LEO in the empire A. D. 741, and, animated with an equal zeal and ardour against the new idolatry, employed all his influence in extirpating and abolishing the worship of images, in opposition to the vigorous efforts of the Roman pontiffs, and the superstitious monks. His manner of proceeding was attended with greater marks of equity and moderation, than had appeared in the measures pursued by LEO; for, knowing the respect which the Greeks had for the decisions of general councils, whose authority they considered as supreme and unlimited in religious matters, he assembled at *Constantinople*, A. D. 754, a council composed of the eastern bishops, in order to have this important question examined with the utmost care, and decided with wisdom, seconded by a just and lawful authority. This assembly, which the Greeks regard as the *seventh oecumenical council*, gave judgment, as was the custom of those times, in favour of the opinion embraced by the emperor, and solemnly condemned the worship and also the use of images [u]. But this decision was not sufficient to vanquish the blind obstinacy of superstition; many adhered still to their idolatrous worship, and none made

the authority of the Latin writers, such as ANASTASIUS, PAUL DEACON, and others, who seem to have known nothing of that audacious insolence, with which these pontiffs are said to have opposed the emperors, and even represent them as having given several marks of their submission and obedience to the imperial authority. Such are the contrary accounts of the Greek and Latin writers; and the most prudent use we can make of them is, to suspend our judgment with respect to a matter, which the obscurity that covers the history of this period, renders it impossible to clear up. All that we can know with certainty is, that the zeal of the two pontiffs abovementioned for the worship of images, furnished to the people of *Italy* the occasion of falling from their allegiance to the Grecian emperors.

[(1) This nick-name was given to CONSTANTINE, from his having defiled the sacred font at his baptism.]

[(u) The authority of this council is not acknowledged by the Roman catholics, no more than the obligation of the *second commandment*, which they have prudently struck out of the decalogue.]

a more turbulent resistance to the wise decree of this CENT.
VIII.
council than the monks, who still continued to excite
commotions in the state, and to blow the flames of se-
dition and rebellion among the people. Their malig-
nity was, however, chastised by CONSTANTINE, who,
filled with a just indignation at their seditious practices,
punished several of them in an exemplary manner, and
by new laws set bounds to the violence of the mona-
stic rage. LEO IV, who, after the death of CONSTAN-
TINE, was declared emperor A. D. 775, adopted the
sentiments of his father and grandfather, and pursued
the measures which they had concerted for the extirpa-
tion of idolatry out of the Christian church; for having
perceived that the worshippers of images could not be
engaged by mild and gentle proceedings to abandon
this superstitious practice, he had recourse to the
coercive influence of penal laws.

XIII. A cup of poison, administered by the impious Under Irene.
counsel of a perfidious spouse, deprived LEO IV of his
life A. D. 780, and rendered the idolatrous cause of
images triumphant. The profligate IRENE, after having
thus accomplished the death of her husband, held the
reins of empire during the minority of her son CON-
STANTINE; and, to establish her authority on more so-
lid foundations, entered into an alliance with ADRIAN,
bishop of Rome, A. D. 786; summoned a council at
Nice in Bithynia, which is known by the title of the
second Nicene council. In this assembly the imperial
laws concerning the new idolatry were abrogated, the
decrees of the council of Constantinople reversed, the
worship of images and of the cross restored, and severe
punishments denounced against such as maintained that
God was the only object of religious adoration. It is
impossible to imagine any thing more ridiculous and
trifling than the arguments, upon which the bishops, as-
sembled in this council, founded their decrees [w]. The

[w] MART. CHEMNITIUS, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, part. iv.
loc. ii. cap. v. p. 52. LENFANT, *Préservatif. contre la Réunion avec le*
Siege de Rome, part. iii. letter xvii. p. 446.

CENT. authority, however, of these decrees was held sacred by
 VIII. the Romans, and the Greeks considered in the light of
 — parricides and traitors all such as refused to submit to
 them. The other enormities of the flagitious IRENE,
 and her deserved fate, cannot, with propriety, be treat-
 ed of here.

The council
 of Francfort.

XIV. In these violent contests, the most of the La-
 tins, such as the Britons, Germans, and Gauls, seemed
 to steer a middle way between the opposite tenets of
 the contending parties. They were of opinion that
 images might be lawfully preserved, and even placed
 in the churches, but, at the same time, they looked up-
 on all worship of them as highly injurious and offen-
 sive to the supreme being [x]. Such, particularly, were
 the sentiments of CHARLEMAGNE, who distinguished
 himself in this important controversy. By the advice
 of the French bishops, who were no friends to the second
 council of *Nice*, he ordered some learned and judicious
 divine to compose *Four Books concerning images*, which
 he sent, in the year 790, to ADRIAN, the Roman pon-
 tiff, with a view to engage him to withdraw his appro-
 bation of the decrees of that council. In this perfor-
 mance the reasons alledged by the *Nicene* bishops to
 justify the worship of images, are refuted with great
 accuracy and spirit [y]. They were not, however, left

[x] The aversion the Britons had to the worship of images may be
 seen in SPELMAN *ad Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i. p. 73.

[y] The books of CHARLEMAGNE concerning *Images*, which deserve
 an attentive perusal, are yet extant; and when they were become ex-
 tremely scarce, were republished at *Hanover* in 8vo in 1731, by the ce-
 lebrated CHRISTOPHER. AUG. HEUMAN, who enriched this edition
 with a learned Preface. These books are adorned with the venerable
 name of CHARLEMAGNE; but it is easy to perceive that they are the
 production of a scholastic divine, and not of an emperor. Several
 learned men have conjectured, that CHARLEMAGNE composed these
 books with the assistance of his preceptor ALCUIN; see HEUMANNI
Præf. p. 51. and BUNAU *Historia Imperii German.* tom. i. p. 490.
 This conjecture, though far from being contemptible, cannot be ad-
 mitted without hesitation; since ALCUIN was in *England* when these
 books were composed. We learn from the history of his life, that he
 went into *England* A. D. 789, and did not return from thence before
 792.

withou-

without defence; ADRIAN, who was afraid of acknow-
 ledging even an emperor for his master, composed an
 answer to the *Four Books* mentioned above, but neither
 his arguments, nor his authority, were sufficient to sup-
 port the superstition he endeavoured to maintain; for,
 in the year 794, CHARLEMAGNE assembled, at *Franc-*
fort on the *Maine*, a council of three hundred bishops,
 in order to re-examine this important question; in which
 the opinion contained in the *Four Books* was solemnly
 confirmed, and the worship of images unanimously con-
 demned [z]. From hence we may conclude, that in
 this century the Latins deemed it neither impious, nor
 unlawful, to dissent from the opinion of the Roman
 pontiff, and even to charge that prelate with error.

XV. While the controversy concerning images was
 at its height, a new contest arose among the Latins and
 Greeks about the source from whence the Holy Ghost
 proceeded. The Latins affirmed, that this divine spirit
 proceeded from the father and the son; the Greeks on
 the contrary, asserted, that it proceeded from the father
 only. The origin of this controversy is covered with
 perplexity and doubt. It is, however, certain, that it
 was agitated in the council of *Gentilli*, near *Paris*,
 A. D. 767, in presence of the emperor's legates [a],
 and from this we may conclude, with a high degree
 of probability, that it arose in *Greece* at that time when
 the contest about images was carried with the greatest
 vehemence. In this controversy the Latins alledged, in
 favour of their opinion, the creed of *Constantinople*,
 which the Spaniards and French had successively cor-
 rupted (upon what occasion is not well known) by ad-
 ding the words *filiusque* in that part of it which con-
 tained the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost. The
 Greeks, on the other hand, made loud complaints of

CENT.
VIII.

The contro-
 versy about
 the derivati-
 on of the
 Holy Ghost

[z] This event is treated with a degree of candour not more lauda-
 ble, than surprizing, by MABILLON, in *Præf. ad Sæculum iv. Actorum*
SS. Ord. Benedicti. part. V. See also JO. GEORG. DORSCHNEUS, *Col-*
lat. ad Concilium Francofordiense, Argentor. 1649. in 4to.

[a] See LE COINTE *Annales Eccles. Francorum*, tom. v. p. 698.

this

CENT.
VIII.

this criminal attempt of the Latins to corrupt by a manifest interpolation a creed, which served as a rule of doctrine for the church universal, and declared this attempt impudent and sacrilegious. Thus the dispute changed at length its object, and was transferred from the matter to the interpolated word above-mentioned [b]: in the following century it was carried on with still greater vehemence, and added new fuel to the dissensions which already portended a schism between the eastern and western churches [c].

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

Ceremonies
multiplied.

I. **T**HE religion of this century consisted almost entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies. We are not, therefore, to wonder that

[b] Learned men generally imagine that this controversy began about the word *filioque*, which some of the Latins had added to the Creed that had been drawn up by the council of *Constantinople*, and that from the word the dispute proceeded to the doctrine itself; see MABILLON, *Act. Sanctior. Ord. Bened. Sæc. iv. part. I. Præf. p. iv.* who is followed by many in this opinion. But this opinion is certainly erroneous. The doctrine was the first subject of controversy, which afterwards extended to the word *filioque*, considered by the Greeks as a manifest interpolation. Among other proofs of this, the council of *Genilli* shews evidently, that the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit had been, for a considerable time, the subject of controversy, when the dispute arose about the word now mentioned. PAGI, in his *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. p. 323. is of opinion, that this controversy had both its date and its occasion from the dispute concerning images: for when the Latins treated the Greeks as heretics, on account of their opposition to image-worship, the Greeks, in their turn, charged the Latins also with heresy, on account of their maintaining that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the father and the son. The learned critic has, however, advanced this opinion without sufficient proof, and we must therefore consider it as no more than a probable conjecture.

[c] See PITHOEI *Hist. controvers. de processione Spiritus S.* at the end of his *Codex Canon. Eccles. Roman.* p. 355. LE QUIEN, *Orien. Christian.* tom. iii. p. 354. GER. J. VOSSIIUS, *De Tribus Symbolis*, Diss. iii. p. 65, and above all, J. GEORG. WALCHIIUS, *Hist. controvers. de processione Spiritus S.* published in 8vo at Jena in 1751.

more

more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying CENT. VIII. and regulating these outward marks of a superstitious devotion, than in correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their understandings and forming their hearts. The administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was deemed the most solemn and important branch of divine worship, was now every where embellished, or rather deformed, with a variety of senseless fopperies, which destroyed the beautiful simplicity of that affecting and salutary institution. We also find manifest traces in this century of that superstitious custom of celebrating what were called *solitary masses* [d], though it be difficult to decide whether they were instituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private persons [e]. Be that as it may, this single custom is sufficient to give us an idea of the superstition and darkness that sat brooding over the Christian church in this ignorant age, and renders it unnecessary to enter into a further detail of the absurd rites with which a designing priesthood continued to disfigure the religion of JESUS.

II. CHARLEMAGNE seemed disposed to stem this torrent of superstition, which gathered force from day to day; for not to mention the zeal with which he opposed the worship of images, there are other circumstances that bear testimony to his intentions in this matter, such as his preventing the multiplication of festivals, by reducing them to a fixed and limited number, his prohibiting the ceremony of consecrating the church-bells by the rite of holy aspersions, and other ecclesiastical laws of his enacting, which redound to his honour. Several circumstances, however, concurred to render his

Charle-
magne's
zeal for the
rites of the
church of
Rome.

[(d) *Solitary or private masses* were those that were celebrated by the priest alone in behalf of souls detained in purgatory, as well as upon some other particular occasions. These masses were prohibited by the laws of the church, but they were a rich source of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a synod assembled at Mentz under CHARLEMAGNE, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and sloth.]

[e] See CHARLEMAGNE's book concerning Images, p. 245; as also GEORGE CALIXTUS, *De Missis Solitariis*, § 12.

designs

CENT.
VIII.

designs abortive, and to blast the success of his worthy purposes, and none more than his excessive attachment to the Roman pontiffs, who were the patrons and protectors of those who exerted themselves in the cause of ceremonies. This vehement passion for the lordly pontiff was inherited by the great prince, of whom we are now speaking, from his father PEPIN, who had already commanded the manner of singing, and the kind of church-music in use at *Rome* to be observed every where in all Christian churches. It was in conformity with his example, and in compliance with the repeated and importunate sollicitation of the pontiff ADRIAN, that CHARLEMAGNE laboured to bring all the Latin churches to follow, as their model the church of *Rome*, not only in the article now mentioned, but also in the whole form of their worship, in every circumstance of their religious service [f]. Several churches however, among which those of *Milan* and *Corbetta*, distinguished themselves eminently, absolutely rejected this proposal, and could neither be brought by persuasion nor violence to change their usual method of worship.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

The ancient
sects recover
strength.

I. **T**HE Arians, Manicheans, and Marchionites, though often depressed by the force of penal laws and the power of the secular arm, gathered strength in the east amidst the tumults and divisions with which the Grecian empire was perpetually agitated, and drew great numbers into the profession of their opinions [g]. The Monothelites, to whose cause the emperor PHILIPPICUS, and many others of the first rank and dignity were most zealous well-wishers, regained

[f] See CHARLEMAGNE'S *Treatise concerning Images*, book I. p. 52. EGINARD, *De vita Caroli Magni*, cap. 26. p. 94. edit. Bessellii.

[g] In *Europe* also Arianism prevailed greatly among the barbarous nations that embraced the Christian faith.

their

their credit in several places. The condition also of both the Nestorians and Monophysites was easy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; their power and influence were considerable; nor were they destitute of means of weakening the Greeks their irreconcilable adversaries, and of spreading their doctrines, and multiplying every where the number of their adherents.

II. In the church which BONIFACE had newly erected in *Germany*, he himself tells us, that there were many perverse and erroneous reprobates, who had no true notion of religion, and his friends and adherents confirm this assertion. But the testimony both of the one and the other is undoubtedly partial, and unworthy of credit; since it appears from the most evident proofs, that the persons here accused of errors and heresies were Irish and French divines, who refused that blind submission to the church of *Rome*, which BONIFACE was so zealous to propagate every where. ADALBERT a Gaul, and CLEMENT a native of *Ireland*, were the persons whose opposition gave the most trouble to the ambitious legate. The former got himself consecrated bishop without the consent of BONIFACE, excited seditions and tumults among the eastern Franks, and appears, indeed, to have been both flagitious in his conduct and erroneous in his opinions [b]; among other irregularities he was the forger of a letter to the human race, which was said to have been written by JESUS CHRIST, and to have been carried from heaven by the arch-angel MICHAEL [i]. As to CLEMENT, his character and sentiments were maliciously misrepresented, since it appears by the best and most authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the true principles and doctrines of Christianity than BONIFACE himself; and hence he is considered by many as a confessor and sufferer for the truth in this barbarous

Clemens and
Adalbert.

[b] See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 82.

[i] There is an edition of this letter published by the learned STEPHEN BALUZIUS, in the *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, tom. ii. p. 396.

CENT.
VIII.

age [k]. Be that as it will, both ADALBERT and CLEMENT were condemned at the instigation of BONIFACE, by the pontiff ZACHARY, in a council assembled at Rome A. D. 748 [l], and in consequence thereof were committed to prison, where, in all probability, they concluded their days.

Felix and
Elipand.

III. Religious discord ran still higher in *Spain, France, and Germany* towards the conclusion of this century, and the most unhappy tumults and commotions were occasioned by a question proposed to FELIX, bishop of *Urgella*, by ELIPAND, arch-bishop of *Toledo*, who desired to know *in what sense CHRIST was the son of God?* The answer which the former gave to this question, was, that CHRIST, considered in his divine nature, was *truly and essentially* the son of God, but that considered as a man, he was only so, *nominally and by adoption*. This doctrine was spread abroad by the two prelates; ELIPAND propagated it in the different provinces of *Spain*, and FELIX throughout *Septimania*, while the pontiff ADRIAN, and the greatest part of the Latin doctors, looked upon this opinion as a renovation of the Nestorian heresy, by its representing CHRIST, as divided into two distinct persons. In consequence of

[k] We find an enumeration of the erroneous opinions of CLEMENT in the letters of BONIFACE *Epistol. cxxxv. p. 189.* See also USSERI *Sylloge Epistolarum Hibernicarum, p. 12.* NOUVEAU *Dictionaire Hist. Critic. tom. i. p. 133.* [The zealous BONIFACE was too ignorant to be a proper judge of heresy, as appears by his condemning VIRGILIUS for believing that there were antipodes. The great heresy of CLEMENT seems to have been his preferring the decisions of scripture to decrees of councils and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God.]

[(l)] This is the true date of the council assembled by ZACHARY for the condemnation of ADALBERT and CLEMENT, and not the year 745, as FLEURY * and MABILLON † have pretended, in which error they are followed by Mr. BOWER, in the third volume of his *History of the Popes, p. 325.* The proof is, that the letter of BONIFACE, in consequence of which this council was assembled, must have been wrote in the year 748; since he declares in that letter, that he had been near thirty years legate of the holy see of *Rome*, into which commission he entered, as all authors agree, about the year 719.]

* *Hist. Ecclesiast. tom. ix. p. 296.* † *Annal. Ord. Benedic. lib. xxii. n. 8.*

this,

this, FELIX was successively condemned, by the councils of *Narbonne*, *Ratisbon*, *Francfort* on the *Main*, and *Rome*, and was finally obliged, by the council of *Aix la-Chapelle*, to retract his error, and to change his opinion [m]. The change he made was, however, rather nominal, than real, the common shift of temporizing divines; for he still retained his doctrine, and died in the firm belief of it at *Lyons*, where he had been banished by CHARLEMAGNE [n]. ELIPAND, on the contrary, lived secure in *Spain* under the dominion of the Saracens, far removed from the thunder of synods and councils, and out of the reach of that coercive power in religious matters, whose utmost efforts can go no further than to make the erroneous, hypocrites or martyrs. Many are of opinion, that the disciples of FELIX, who were called *Adoptians*, departed much less from the doctrine generally received among Christians, than is commonly imagined; and that what chiefly distinguished their tenets was the term they used, and their manner of expression, rather than a real diversity of sentiments [o]. But as this sect, together with their chief, thought proper to make use of singular, and sometimes of contradictory, expressions; this furnished such as accused them of Nestorianism, with very plausible reasons to support their charge.

[(m) The council of *Narbonne* that condemned FELIX, was held in the year 788, that of *Ratisbon* in 792, that of *Francfort* in 794, that of *Rome* in 799.]

[n] The authors, who have written concerning the sect of FELIX, are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 482. Add to these PETRUS de MARCA, in his *Marca Hispanica*, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 368. JO. de FERRERAS, *Histoire Generale d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 518. 523. 528. 535. 560. JO. MABILLON *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, part. II. There are also very particular accounts given of FELIX by DOM. COLONIA, *Histoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 79. and by the Benedictine monks in their *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 434.

[o] JO. GEORGE DORSCHÆUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofurt.* p. 101. WERENFELS, *De Logomachiis Eruditor.* p. 459. Opp. JAC. BASMAGIUS *Præf. ad Etherium* in HENR. CANISII *Lecton. antiquis*, tom. i. part. I. p. 284. GEORGE CALIXTUS, *Singul. Diff.*

THE
NINTH CENTURY.
PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous events which happened to the church during this century.

CENT. IX. I. **T**HE reign of CHARLEMAGNE had been singularly auspicious to the Christian cause; the life of that great prince was principally employed in the most zealous efforts to propagate and establish the religion of JESUS among the Huns, Saxons, Frieslanders, and other unenlightened nations; but his piety was mixed with violence, and his spiritual conquests were generally made by the force of arms, and this impure mixture tarnishes the lustre of his noblest exploits. His son LEWIS, undeservedly surnamed the MEEK, inherited the defects of his illustrious father without his virtues, and was his equal in violence and cruelty, but vastly his inferior in all worthy and valuable accomplishments. Under his reign a very favourable opportunity was offered of propagating the gospel among the northern nations, and particularly among the inhabitants of *Sweden* and *Denmark*. A petty king of *Futland*, named HARALD KLACK, being driven from both his kingdom and country, in the year 826, by REGNER LODBROCK, threw himself at the emperor's feet, and implored his succours against the usurper. LEWIS granted his request,

The Swedes,
Danes, and
Cimbrians
converted.

quest, and promised the exiled prince his protection and assistance, on condition, however, that he would embrace Christianity, and admit the ministers of that religion to preach in his dominions. HARALD submitted to these conditions, was baptized with his brother at *Mentz*, A. D. 826, and returned into his country attended by two eminent divines, ANSGAR or ANSCHAIRE and AUTHBERT; the former a monk of *Corbey* in *Westphalia*, and the latter belonging to a monastery of the same name in *France*. These venerable missionaries preached the gospel with remarkable success, during the space of two years, to the inhabitants of *Cimbria* and *Jutland*.

II. After the death of his learned and pious companion AUTHBERT, the zealous and indefatigable ANSGAR made a voyage into *Sweden*, A. D. 828, where his ministerial labours were also crowned with a distinguished success. As he returned from thence into *Germany* in the year 831, he was loaded by LEWIS the MEEK with ecclesiastical honours, being created arch-bishop of the new church at *Hamburg*, and also of the whole north, to which dignity the superintendence of the church of *Bremen* was afterwards added in the year 844. The profits attached to this high and honourable charge were very inconsiderable, while the perils and labours, in which it involved the pious prelate, were truly formidable. Accordingly ANSGAR travelled frequently among the Danes, Cimbrians, and Swedes, in order to promote the cause of CHRIST, to form new churches, and to confirm and establish those which he had already gathered together; in all which arduous enterprizes he passed his life in the most imminent dangers, until he concluded his glorious course A. D. 865 [a].

The promotion and labours of Ansgar.

III. About

[a] The writers to whom we are indebted for accounts of this pious and illustrious prelate, the founder of the Cimbrian, Danish, and Swedish churches, are mentioned by JO. ALBERT. FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 292. as also in his *Lux Evangelii orbis terrarum exoriens*, p. 425. Add to these the Benedictine monks, in their *Histoire Lit. de la France*, tom. v. p. 277. *Acta Sanctor. Mens. Februar.* tom. i. p. 391. ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccles. Danicæ Diplomatici*,

CENT. IX.

Conversion
of the Bul-
garians, Bo-
hemians,
and Mora-
vians.

III. About the middle of this century the Mœsians [b], Bulgarians, and Gazarians; and after them the Bohemians and Moravians were converted to Christianity by METHODIUS and CYRIL, two Greek monks, whom the empress THEODORA had sent to dispel the darkness of these idolatrous nations [c]. The zeal of CHARLEMAGNE, and his pious missionaries, had been formerly exerted in the same cause, and among the same people [d], but with so little success, that any faint notions which they had received of the Christian doctrine were entirely effaced. The instructions of the Grecian doctors had a much better and also a more permanent effect; but as they recommended to their new disciples the forms of worship, and the various rites and ceremonies used among the Greeks [e], this was the occasion of much religious animosity and contention in after times, when the lordly pontiffs exerted all their vehemence and employed every means, though with imperfect success, of reducing these nations under the discipline and jurisdiction of the Latin church.

Of the Sla-
vonians and
Russians.

IV. Under the reign of BASILIUS, the Macedonian, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks in the year 867, the Slavonians, Arentani, and certain provinces of *Dalmatia*, sent a solemn embassy to *Constantinople* to declare their resolution of submitting to the jurisdiction of the Grecian empire, and of embracing, at the same time, the Christian religion. This proposal was received with admiration and joy, and it was also answered by a suitable ardour and zeal for the conver-

matici, tom. i. p. 18. JO. MÖLLERUS, *Cimbriæ Litteratæ*, tom. iii. p. 8. These writers give us also circumstantial accounts of EBBO, WITMAR, REMBERT, and others, who were either the fellow-labourers or successors of ANSGAR.

[(b)] We have translated thus the term *Myfi*, which is an error in the original. Dr MOSHEIM, like many others, has confounded the Myfians with the inhabitants of *Mæsia*, by giving the latter, who were Europeans the title of the former, who dwelt in *Asia*.]

[c] JO. GEORGE STREDOWSKY, *Sacra Moraviæ Historia*, lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 94. compared with PET. KOHLII *Introduc. in Historiam e rem. Litter. Slavorum*, p. 124.

[d] STREDOWSKY *loc. cit.* lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55.

[e] L' ENFANT, *Histoire de la guerre des Hussites*, livr. i. ch. i. p. 2.

on of a people, which seemed so ingenuously disposed CENT. IX.
 to embrace the truth : accordingly a competent number
 of Grecian doctors were sent among them to instruct
 them in the knowledge of the gospel, and to admit
 them by baptism into the Christian church [f]. The
 warlike nation of the Russians were converted under the
 same emperor, but not in the same manner, nor from
 the same noble and rational motives. Having entered
 into a treaty of peace with that prince, they were en-
 gaged by various presents and promises to embrace the
 gospel, in consequence of which they received not only
 the Christian ministers that were appointed to instruct
 them, but also an arch-bishop, whom the Grecian pa-
 triarch IGNATIUS had sent among them to perfect their
 conversion and to establish their church [g]. Such were
 the beginnings of Christianity among the bold and war-
 like Russians, who were inhabitants of the *Ukraine*,
 and who, a little before their conversion, fitted out a
 formidable fleet, and setting sail from *Kiovia* for *Con-*
stantinople, spread terror and dismay through the whole
 empire [h].

V. It

[f] We are indebted for this account of the conversion of the Slavo-
 nians to the treatise *De administrando imperio*, composed by the learned
 emperor CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGEN, which is published by
 BANDURIUS in *Imperium Orientale*, tom. i. p. 72, 73. CONSTAN-
 TINE gives the same account of this event in the life of his grandfather
 BASILIUS the Macedonian, § 54. published in the *Corpus Byzantinum*,
 tom. xvi. p. 133, 134.

[g] CONSTANTINUS, *Porph. Vita Basilii Macedonis*, § 96, p. 157.
Corp. Byzant. See also the *Narratio de Ruthenorum Conversione*, pub-
 lished both in Greek and Latin by BANDURIUS, in his *Imperium Orien-*
tale, notis ad Porphyrogenetam de administrando imperio, p. 62. tom. ii.

[h] The learned LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p.
 1257, gives a very inaccurate account of the Russians, who were con-
 verted to Christianity under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian,
 and in this he does no more than adopt the errors of many who wrote
 before him upon the same subject. Nor is he consistent with himself ;
 for in one place he affirms, that the people here spoken of were the
 Russians, that lived in the neighbourhood of the Bulgarians ; while in
 another he maintains, that by these Russians we are to understand the
 Gazarians. The only reason he alledges to support this latter opinion
 is, that, among the Christian doctors sent to instruct the Russians, men-
 tion is made of CYRIL, who converted the Gazari to Christianity.
 This reason shews, that the learned writer had a most imperfect know-

CENT. IX.

The nature
of these con-
versions.

V. It is proper to observe, with respect to the various conversions which we have now been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than those of the preceding ages. The ministers, who were now sent to instruct and convert the barbarous nations, employed not, like many of their predecessors, the terror of penal laws, to affright men into the profession of Christianity; nor, in establishing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontiffs: their views were more noble and their conduct more suitable, to the genius of the religion they professed. They had principally in view the happiness of mankind, endeavoured to promote the gospel of truth and peace by the methods of a rational persuasion, and seconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. It must, however, be confessed, that the doctrine they taught was far from being conformable to that pure and excellent rule of faith and practice laid down by our divine Saviour, and his holy apostles; their religious system was, on the contrary, corrupted with a variety of superstitious rites and a multitude of absurd inventions. It is further certain, that there remained among these converted nations too many traces of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, notwithstanding the zealous labours of their Christian guides; and it appears also that these pious missionaries were contented with introducing an external profession of the true religion among their new proselytes. It would be, however, unjust to accuse them on this account of negligence or corruption in the discharge of their ministry, since, in order to gain over these fierce and savage nations to the church, it may have been absolutely neces-

ledge both of these Russians and the Gazari. He is also guilty of other mistakes upon the same subject. There is a much better explanation of this matter given by the very learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED. BAYER, in his *Diss. de Russorum prima expeditione Constantinopolitana*, which is published in the sixth volume of the *Commentaria Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitane*.

fary

fary to indulge them in some of their infirmities and pre-judices, and to connive at many things, which they could not approve, and which, in other circumstances, they would have been careful to correct. CENT. IX.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the calamities which happened to the church during this century.

I. **T**H E Saracens had now extended their usurpations with an amazing success. Masters of *Asia*, a few provinces excepted, they pushed their conquests to the extremities of *India*, and obliged the greatest part of *Africa* to receive their yoke; nor were their enterprizes in the west without effect, since *Spain* and *Sardinia* submitted to their arms, and fell under their dominion. But their conquests did not end here: for in the year 827, by the treason of EUPHEMIUS, they made themselves masters of the rich and fertile island of *Sicily*; and towards the conclusion of this century the Asiatic Saracens seized upon several cities of *Calabria*, and spread the terror of their victorious arms even to the very walls of *Rome*, while *Crete*, *Corfica*, and other adjacent islands were either joined to their possessions, or laid waste by their incursions. It is easy to comprehend that this overgrown prosperity of a nation accustomed to bloodshed and rapine, and which also beheld the Christians with the utmost aversion, must have been every where detrimental to the progress of the gospel, and to the tranquillity of the church. In the east, more especially, a prodigious number of Christian families embraced the religion of their conquerors, that they might live in the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. Many, indeed, refused this base and criminal compliance, and with a pious magnanimity adhered to their principles in the face of persecution; but such were gradually reduced to a miserable condition, and were not only robbed of the best part of their wealth, and deprived of their worldly advantages, but, what

The progress
of the Saracens towards
universal
empire.

was

CENT. IX. was still more deplorable, they fell by degrees into such incredible ignorance and stupidity, that, in process of time, there were scarcely any remains of Christianity to be found among them besides the mere name, and a few external rites and ceremonies. The European Saracens, particularly those who were settled in *Spain*, were of a much milder disposition, and seemed to have put off the greatest part of their native ferocity; so that the Christians, generally speaking, lived peaceably under their dominion, and were permitted to observe the laws and to enjoy the privileges of their holy profession. It must, however, be confessed, that this mild and tolerating conduct of the Saracens was not without some few exceptions of cruelty [i].

The Nor-
mans.

II. The European Christians had the most cruel sufferings to undergo from another quarter, even from the insatiable fury of a swarm of barbarians that issued out from the northern provinces. The Normans, under which general term are comprehended the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, whose habitations lay along the coasts of the Baltic sea, were a people accustomed to carnage and rapine. Their petty kings and chiefs, who subsisted by piracy and plunder, had already, during the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, infested with their fleets the coasts of the German ocean, but were restrained by the opposition they met with from the vigilance and activity of that warlike prince. In this century, however, they became more bold and enterprising, made frequent irruptions into *Germany*, *Britain*, *Friesland*, and the Gauls, and carried along with them, wherever they went, fire and sword, desolation and horror. The impetuous fury of these savage barbarians not only spread desolation through the *Spanish* provinces [k], but even penetrated into the very heart of *Italy*;

for

[i] See, for example, the account that is given of EULOGIUS, who suffered martyrdom at *Cordoua* in the *Acta Sanctorum ad d. xi. Martii*, tom. ii. p. 88; as also of RODERICK and SALOMON, two Spanish martyrs of this century. *ibid. ad d. xiii. Martii*, p. 238.

[k] JO. de FERRARAS *Histoire Gener. d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 583. Piracy was esteemed among the northern nations a very honourable and noble

for in the year 857, they sacked and pillaged the city CENT. IX. of *Luna* in the most cruel manner, and about three years after *Pisa*, and several other cities of *Italy*, met with the same fate [l]. The ancient histories of the Franks abound with the most dismal accounts of their horrid exploits.

III. The first views of these savage invaders extended no further than plunder; but charmed at length with the beauty and fertility of the provinces, which they were so cruelly depopulating, they began to form settlements in them, nor were the European princes in a condition to oppose their usurpations. On the contrary, CHARLES the BALD was obliged, in the year 850, to resign a considerable part of his dominions to this powerful banditti [m]; and a few years after, under the reign of CHARLES the GROSS, emperor and king of *France*, the famous Norman chief GODOFRED entered with an army into *Friesland*, and obstinately refused to sheath his sword before he was master of the whole province [n]. Such, however, of the Normans as settled among the Christians, contracted a gentler turn of mind, and gradually departed from their primitive brutality. Their marriages with the Christians contributed, no doubt, to civilize them; and engaged them to abandon the superstition of their ancestors with more facility, and to embrace the gospel with more readiness, than they would have otherwise done. Thus the proud conqueror of *Friesland* solemnly embraced the Christian religion.

noble profession; and hence the sons of kings, and the young nobility, were trained up to this species of robbery, and made it their principal business to perfect themselves in it. Nor will this appear very surprising to such as consider the religion of these nations, and the barbarism of the times. See JO. LUD. HOLBERG. *Historia Danorum et Norvegorum Navalis*, in *Scriptis Societatis Scientiar. Hafniensis*, tom. iii. p. 349. in which there are a multitude of curious and interesting relations concerning the ancient piracies, drawn from the Danish and Norwegian annals.

[l] See the *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, published by MURATORI.

[m] *Annales incerti Auctoris*, in PITHOEI *Scriptor. Francic.* p. 46.

[n] REGINONIS PRUMIENSIS *Annal.* lib. ii. f. 60. in PISTORII *Scriptor. German.*

on

CENT. IX. on after he had received in marriage, from CHARLES the GROSS, GISELA, the daughter of LOTHAIRE the younger.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

The state of
letters a-
mong the
Greeks.

I. **T**HE Grecian empire, in this century, was in circumstances every way proper to extinguish all taste for letters and philosophy, and all zeal for the cultivation of the sciences. The liberality, however, of the emperors, some of whom were men of learning and taste, and the wise precautions taken by the patriarchs of *Constantinople*, among whom PHOTIUS deserves the first rank in point of erudition, contributed to attach a certain number of learned men to that imperial city, and thus to prevent the total decline of letters. Accordingly we find in *Constantinople*, at this time, several persons who excelled in eloquence and poetry; some who displayed, in their writings against the Latins, a considerable knowledge of the art of reasoning, and a high degree of dexterity in the management of controversy; and others who composed the history of their own times with accuracy and with elegance. The controversy with the Latins, when it grew more keen and animated, contributed in a particular manner to excite the literary emulation of the disputants, rendered them studious to acquire new ideas, and a rich and copious elocution, adorned with the graces of elegance and wit; and thus roused and invigorated talents that were ready to perish in indolence and sloth.

II. We

II. We learn from the accounts of ZONARAS, that CENT. IX. the study of philosophy lay for a long time neglected in this age; but it was revived, with a zeal for the sciences in general, under the emperor THEOPHILUS, and his son MICHAEL III. This revival of letters was principally owing [o] to the encouragement and protection which the learned received from BARDAS, who had been declared CÆSAR, himself a weak and illiterate man, but a warm friend of the celebrated PHOTIUS, the great patron of science, by whose council he was, undoubtedly, directed in this matter. At the head of all the learned men to whom BARDAS committed the culture of the sciences, he placed LEO, surnamed the WISE, a man of the most profound and uncommon erudition, and who afterwards was consecrated bishop of *Thessalonica*. PHOTIUS explained the *Categories* of ARISTOTLE, while MICHAEL PSELLUS gave a brief exposition of the other works of that great philosopher.

Of philo-
sophy.

III. The Arabians, who, instead of cultivating the arts and sciences, had thought of nothing hitherto but of extending their territories, were now excited to literary pursuits by ALMAMUNIS, otherwise called ABU GAAFAR ABDALLAH, whose zeal for the advancement of letters was great, and whose munificence towards men of learning and genius was truly royal. Under the auspicious protection of this celebrated CALIPH of *Babylon* and *Egypt*, the Arabians made a rapid and astonishing progress in various kinds of learning. This excellent prince began his reign about the time of the death of CHARLEMAGNE, and died in the year 833. He erected the famous schools of *Bagdad*, *Cufa*, and *Basora*, and established seminaries of learning in several other cities; he drew to his court men of eminent parts by his extraordinary liberality, set up noble libraries in various places, had translations made of the best Grecian productions into the Arabic language at a vast expence, and employed every method of promoting the cause of learning, that became a great and generous prince,

The state of
learning a-
mong the
Arabians.

[o] *Annalium* tom. ii. lib. xvi. p. 126. tom. x. *Corporis Byzantini*.
whose

CENT. IX. whose zeal for the sciences was attended with knowledge [p]. It was under the reign of this immortal CALIPH, that the Arabians began to take pleasure in the Grecian learning, and to propagate it, by degrees, not only in *Syria* and *Africa*, but also in *Spain* and *Italy*; and from this period they give us a long catalogue of celebrated philosophers, physicians, astronomers, and mathematicians, who were ornaments to their nation thorough several succeeding ages [q]. And in this certainly they do not boast without reason, though we are not to consider, as literally true, all the wonderful and pompous things which the more modern writers of the Saracen history tell us of these illustrious philosophers.

After this period the European Christians profited much by the Arabian learning, and were highly indebted to the Saracens for the improvement they made in the various sciences. For the mathematics, astronomy, physic, and philosophy, that were taught in *Europe* from the tenth century, were, for the most part, drawn from the Arabian schools, that were established in *Spain* and *Italy*, or, from the writings of the Arabian sages. And from hence the Saracens may, in one respect, be justly considered as the restorers of learning in *Europe*.

The state of letters under Charlemagne, and his successors.

IV. In that part of *Europe*, that was subject to the dominion of the Franks, CHARLEMAGNE laboured with incredible zeal and ardour for the advancement of useful learning, and animated his subjects to the culture of the sciences in all their various branches. So that, had his successors been disposed to follow his example, and capable of acting upon the noble plan he formed, the empire, in a little time, would have been entirely delivered from barbarism and ignorance. It is true, this great prince left in his family a certain spirit of emulation, which animated his immediate successors

[p] ABULPHARAIUS, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 246. GEORG. ELMACIN. *Histor. Saracen.* lib. ii. p. 139. BARTHOL. HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* Article *Mamun.* p. 545.

[q] See the treatise of LEO AFRICANUS, *De Medicis et Philosophis Arabibus*, published a second time by FABRICIUS, in the twelfth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 259.

to imitate, in some measure, his zeal for the prosperity of the republic of letters. LEWIS the MEEK both formed and executed several designs that were extremely conducive to the progress of the arts and sciences [r]; and his zeal, in this respect, was surpassed by the ardour with which his son CHARLES the BALD exerted himself in the propagation of letters, and in exciting the emulation of the learned by the most alluring marks of his protection and favour. This great patron of the sciences drew the *literati* to his court from all parts, took a particular delight in their conversation, multiplied and embellished the seminaries of learning, and protected, in a more especial manner, the aulic school, of which mention has been formerly made, and which was first erected in the seventh century, in order to the education of the royal family, and the first nobility [s]. His brother LOTHAIRE endeavoured to revive in *Italy* the drooping sciences, and to restore them from that state of languor and decay into which the corruption and indolence of the clergy had permitted them to fall. For this purpose he erected schools in the eight principal cities of *Italy*, A. D. 823 [t], but with little success, since it appears that that country was entirely destitute of men of learning and genius during the ninth century [u].

In *England* learning had a better fate under the auspicious protection of king ALFRED, who has acquired an immortal name, not only by the admirable progress he made in all kinds of elegant and useful knowledge [w], but also by the care he took to multiply men of letters

[r] See the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 583.

[s] HERMAN CONRINGII *Antiquit. Academicæ*, p. 320. CÆS. EG. DU. BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 178. LAUNOIUS *De Scholis Caroli M.* cap. xi, xii, p. 47. *Histoire Litter de la France*, tom. v. p. 483.

[t] See the edict for that purpose among the *Capitularia* in MURATORI *Rerum Italicar.* tom. i. part II. p. 151.

[u] See MURATORI'S *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 829.

[w] See ANT. WOOD, *Hist. et Antiquit. Academ. Oxoniens.* lib. i. p. 13. BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 211. *General Dictionary*, at the article ALFRED, [This prince among other pious and learned labours,

CENT. IX. letters and genius in his dominions, and to restore the sciences, sacred and profane, the credit and lustre they so eminently deserve [x].

Impediments to the progress of learning.

V. But the infelicity of the times rendered the effects of all this zeal and all these projects for the advancement of learning much less considerable than might have otherwise been expected. The protectors and patrons of the learned, were themselves learned; their authority was respectable, and their munificence was boundless; and yet the progress of science towards perfection was but slow, because the interruptions arising from the troubled state of *Europe* were frequent. The discords that arose between LEWIS the MEEK and his sons, which were succeeded by a rupture between the latter, retarded considerably the progress of letters in the empire; and the incursions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted *Europe* during the whole course of this century, were so fatal to the culture of the arts and sciences, that in most of the European provinces, and even in *France*, there remained but a small number who truly deserved the title of learned men [y]. The wretched and incoherent fragments of erudition that yet remained among the clergy, were confined to the monasteries, and to the episcopal schools; but the zeal of the monkish and priestly orders for the improvement

labours, translated the *Pastoral* of GREGORY I, BOETHIUS *De Consolatione*, and BEDE's *Ecclesiastical History*.]

[(x) This excellent prince not only encouraged by his protection and liberality such of his own subjects as made any progress in the liberal arts and sciences, but invited over from foreign countries men of distinguished talents, whom he fixed in a seminary at *Oxford*, and of consequence, may be looked upon as the founder of that noble university. JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, who had been in the service of CHARLES the BALD, and GRIMBALD, a monk of *St. Bertin* in *France*, were the most famous of those learned men who came from abroad; ASSERIUS, WEREFRID, PLEGMUND, DUNWUF, WULFSIG, and the abbot of *St. Neot's*, deserve the first rank among the English *literati*, who adorned the age of ALFRED. See COLLIER's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. book III. p. 165, 166, &c. RAPIN THOYRAS, in the reign of this illustrious monarch.]

[y] SERVATI LUPI *Epistolæ* xxxiv. p. 69. CONRINGII *Antiq. Acad.* p. 322. *Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251.

of the mind, and the culture of the sciences, diminished CENT.IX. in proportion as their revenues increased, so that their indolence and ignorance grew with their possessions.

VI. It must, however, be confessed, that several ex-
Examples of learned men who flourished in this century.
 amples of learned men, whose zeal for the sciences was kindled by the encouragement and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, shone forth with a distinguished lustre through the darkness of this barbarous age. Among these, the first rank is due to RABANUS MAURUS, whose fame was great through all *Germany* and *France*, and to whom the youth resorted, in prodigious numbers from all parts, to receive his instructions in the liberal arts and sciences. The writers of history, whose works have deservedly preserved their names from oblivion, are EGINHARD, FREULPH, THEGAN, HAYMO, ANASTASIUS, ADO, and others of less note. FLORUS, WALAFRIDUS, STRABO, BERTHARIUS, and RABANUS, excelled in poetry. SMARAGDUS and BERTHARIUS were eminent for their skill in grammar and languages; as was also the celebrated RABANUS already mentioned, who acquired a very high degree of reputation by a learned and subtile treatise concerning the causes and the rise of languages. The Greek and Hebrew erudition was cultivated with considerable success by WILLIAM, SERVATUS LUPUS, SCOTUS, and others. EGINHARD, AGOBARD, HINCMAR, and SERVATUS LUPUS, were much celebrated for the eloquence, which appeared both in their discourses and in their writings [z].

VII. The philosophy and logic that were taught in the European schools during this century, scarcely deserved such honourable titles, and were little better than an empty jargon. There were, however, to be found in various places, particularly among the Irish, men of

Johannes Scotus Eri-gena!

[z] Such as are desirous of a more circumstantial account of these writers, and of their various productions, may consult the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251 to 271. Or the more ample account given of them by the celebrated LE BEUF, in his *Etat des Sciences en France depuis Charlemagne jusqu' au Roi Robert*, which is published in his *Recueil de divers ecrits pour d'Eclaircissemens à l'Histoire de France*, tom. ii. p. 1. Paris 1738, in 8vo.

CENT. IX. acute parts, and extensive knowledge, who were perfectly well intitled to the appellation of philosophers. The chief of these was JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA [a], a native of *Ireland*, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, who delighted so much in his conversation as to honour him with a place at his table. SCOTUS was endowed with an excellent and truly superior genius, and was considerably versed both in Greek and Latin erudition. He explained to his disciples the philosophy of ARISTOTLE, for which he was singularly well qualified by his thorough knowledge of the Greek language; but as his genius was too bold and aspiring to confine it self to the authority and decisions of the Stagyrice, he pushed his philosophical researches yet further, dared to think for himself, and ventured to pursue truth without any other guide than his own reason. We have yet extant of his composition, *Five Books concerning the division of nature*, an intricate and subtle production, in which the causes and principles of all things are investigated with a considerable degree of sagacity, and in which also the precepts of Christianity are allegorically explained, yet in such a manner as to shew that their ultimate end is the union of the soul with the supreme Being. He was the first, who blended the *scholastic theology* with the *mystic*, and formed them into one system. It has also been imagined, that he was far from rejecting the opinions of those who consider the union of *God* and *nature*, as similar to the union that subsists between the soul and the body, a notion much the same with that of many ancient philosophers, who looked upon the deity as the soul of the world. But it may, perhaps, be alledged, and not without reason, that what SCOTUS said upon this subject amounted to no more than what the *Realists* [b], as they

[[a] ERIGENA signifies properly a native of *Ireland*, as *Erin*, or *Irin*, was the ancient name of that kingdom.]

[[b] The *Realists*, who followed the doctrine of ARISTOTLE with respect to *universal ideas*, were so called in opposition to the *Nominalists*, who embraced the hypothesis of ZENO and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate subject. ARISTOTLE held, against PLATO, that

are called, maintained afterwards, though it must be allowed that he has expressed himself in a very perplexed and obscure manner [c]. This celebrated philosopher formed no particular sect, at least as far as is come to our knowledge; and this will be considered, by those who are acquainted with the spirit of the times he lived in, as a proof that his immense learning was accompanied with meekness and modesty.

About this time lived a certain person named MACARIUS, a native of *Ireland*, who propagated in *France* that enormous error, which was afterwards adopted and professed by AVERROES, that one individual intelligence, one soul performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race. This error was confuted by RATRAM, a famous monk of *Corbey* [d]. Before these writers flourished DUNGAL, a native of *Ireland* also, who left his country, and retired into a French monastery, where he lived during the reigns of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the MEEK, and taught philosophy and astronomy with the greatest reputation [e]. HERIC, a monk of *Auxerre*, made likewise an eminent figure a-

previous to, and independent on, matter, there were no universal *ideas* or *essences*, and that the ideas or exemplars which the latter supposed to have existed in the divine mind, and to have been the *models* of all created things, had been eternally pressed upon matter, and were coëval with, and inherent in, their objects. ZENO and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, maintained, that these pretended *universals* had neither *form* nor *essence*, and were no more than mere terms and *nominal* representations of their particular objects. The doctrine of ARISTOTLE prevailed unto the eleventh century, when ROSCELINUS embraced the Stoical system, and founded the sect of the *Nominalists*, whose sentiments were propagated with great success by the famous ABELARD. These two sects differed considerably among themselves, and explained, or rather obscured, their respective tenets in a variety of ways.]

[c] The work here alluded to was published at *Oxford*, by Mr. THOMAS GALE, in the year 1681. The learned HEUMAN has made several extracts from it, and given also an ample and learned account of SCOTUS, in his *Acts of the Philosophers*, written in *German*, tom. iii. p. 358.

[d] MABILLON; *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part. II. Act. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, § 156. p. 53.

[e] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 493.

CENT. IX. ——— mong the learned of this age ; he was a man of uncommon sagacity, was endowed with a great and aspiring genius, and is said, in many things, to have anticipated the famous DESCARTES in the manner of investigating truth [f].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church and its form of government during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. **T**HE impiety and licentiousness of the greatest part of the clergy arose, at this time, to an enormous height, and stand, upon record, in the unanimous complaints of the most candid and impartial writers of this century [g]. In the east tumult, discord, conspiracies, and treasons, reigned uncontrouled, and all things were carried by violence and force. These abuses appeared in many things, but particularly in the election of the patriarchs of *Constantinople*. The favour of the court was become the only step to that high and important office ; and as the patriarch's continuance in that eminent post depended upon such an uncertain and precarious foundation, nothing was more usual, than to see a prelate pulled down from his episcopal throne by an imperial decree. In the western provinces, the bishops were become voluptuous and effeminate to a very high degree. They passed their lives amidst the splendor of courts, and the pleasures of a luxurious indolence, which corrupted their taste, extinguished their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the solemn duties of their function [h] ;

while

[f] LE BEUF, *Memoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 481. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iv. *M. Junii ad d. xxiv.* p. 829. *Et ad d. xxxi. Jul.* p. 249. For this philosopher has obtained a place among the saintly order.

[g] See AGOBARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotii*, § 13. p. 137. tom. i. Opp. ed. Baluzii.

[h] The reader will be convinced of this by consulting AGOBARD *passim*, and by looking over the laws enacted in the Latin councils for restrain-

restrain-

while the inferior clergy were sunk in licentiousness, CENT. IX. minded nothing but sensual gratifications, and infected, with the most heinous vices, the flock, whom it was the very business of their ministry to preserve, or to deliver, from the contagion of iniquity. Besides, the ignorance of the sacred order was, in many places, so deplorable, that few of them could either read or write; and still fewer were capable of expressing their wretched notions with any degree of method or perspicuity. Hence it happened, that when letters were to be penned, or any matter of consequence was to be committed to writing, they had commonly recourse to some one person, who was supposed to be endowed with superior abilities, as appears in the case of SERVATUS LUPUS [i].

II. Many circumstances concurred, particularly in the European nations, to produce and augment this corruption and licentiousness, so shameful in an order of men, who were set apart to exhibit examples of piety to the rest of the world. Among these we may reckon as the chief sources of the evil under consideration, the calamities of the times, even the bloody and perpetual wars that were carried between LEWIS the MEER, and his family, the incursions and conquests of the barbarous nations, the gross and incredible ignorance of the nobility, and the affluence and riches that flowed in upon the churches and religious seminaries from all quarters. Many other causes also contributed to dishonour the church, by introducing into it a corrupt ministry. A nobleman, who through want of talents, activity, or courage, was rendered incapable of appearing with dignity in the cabinet, or with honour in the field, immediately turned his views towards the church, aimed at a distinguished place among its chiefs and rulers, and became, in consequence, a contagious example of stu-

The cause
of this cor-
ruption.

restraining the disorders of the clergy. See also SERVATUS LUPUS *Epist.* xxxv. p. 73. 281. and STEPH. BALUZ. in *Adnot.* p. 378.

[i] See the works of SERVATUS LUPUS *Epist.* xcvi. xcix. p. 126. 142. 148. as also his *Life*. See also RODOLPHI *Bituricensis Capitula ad clerum suum*, in BALUZII *Miscellaneis*, tom. vi. p. 139. 148.

CENT. IX. pidity and vice to the inferior clergy [k]. The patrons of churches, in whom resided the right of election, unwilling to submit their disorderly conduct to the keen censure of zealous and upright pastors, industriously looked for the most abject, ignorant, and worthless ecclesiastics, to whom they committed the cure of souls [l]. But one of the circumstances, which contributed in a particular manner to render, at least, the higher clergy wicked and depraved, and to take off their minds from the duties of their station, was the obligation they were under of performing certain services to their sovereigns, in consequence of the possessions they derived from the royal bounty. The bishops and heads of monasteries held many lands and castles by a feudal tenure, and being thereby bound to furnish their princes with a certain number of soldiers in time of war, were obliged also to take the field themselves at the head of these troops [m], and thus to act in a sphere that was utterly inconsistent with the nature and duties of their sacred character. Besides all this, it often happened, that rapacious princes, in order to satisfy the craving wants of their soldiers and domestics, boldly invaded the possessions of the church, which they distributed among their armies; in consequence of which the priests and monks, in order to avoid perishing through hunger, abandoned themselves to the practice of violence, fraud, and all sorts of crimes, which they looked upon as the only means, they had left, of procuring themselves a subsistence [n].

III. The

[k] HINCMARUS, *Oper. Posterior. contra Godescalcum*, cap. xxxvi. tom. i. Opp. p. 318. SERVATUS LUPUS *Epist.* lxxix. p. 120.

[l] AGOBARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotum*, cap. xi. p. 341. tom. i. Opp.

[m] STEPH. BALUZII *Appendix Actor. ad Servatum*, p. 508, MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi.* tom. ii. p. 446. MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 587. FRESNE *ad Joinvillii Hist. Ludovici S.* p. 75, 76.

[n] AGOBARDUS, *De dispens. rerum Ecclesiast.* § 4. p. 270. tom. i. Opp. FLODARDUS, *Histor. Eccles. Rbemensis*, lib. iii. cap. ix. SERVATUS LUPUS *Epist.* xlv. p. 87. 437, &c. MURATORI, tom. vi. *Antiq. Ital. medii. ævi.* p. 302. LUD. THOMASIN, *Disciplina Ecclesiæ vet. et nova circa beneficia*, part. II. lib. iii. cap. xi. These corrupt measures

III. The Roman pontiffs were raised to that high CENT. IX.
 dignity by the suffrages of the sacerdotal order, accom-
 panied with the voice of the people; but after their e-
 lection, the approbation of the emperor was necessary in
 order to their consecration [o]. There is indeed, yet ex-
 tant, an edict supposed to have been published, in the year
 817, by LEWIS the MEER, in which he abolishes this
 imperial right, and grants to the Romans, not only the
 power of electing their pontiff, but also the privilege of
 installing and consecrating him when elected, without
 waiting for the consent of the emperor [p]. But this
 grant will deceive none, who inquire into this matter
 with any degree of attention and diligence, since se-
 veral learned men have proved it spurious by the most
 irresistible arguments [q]. It must, however, be con-
 fessed, that after the time of CHARLES the BALD, a new
 scene of things arose; and the important change above-
 mentioned was really introduced. That prince having
 obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the
 bishop of *Rome*, returned this eminent service by deli-
 vering the succeeding pontiffs from the obligation of
 waiting for the consent of the emperors, in order to
 their being installed in their office. And thus we find,
 that from the time of EUGENIUS III, who was raised to
 the pontificate A. D. 884, the election of the bishops
 of *Rome* was carried on without the least regard to law,
 order, or even decency, and was generally attended
 with civil tumults and dissensions, until the reign of
 OTHO the GREAT, who put a stop to these disorderly
 proceedings.

The Roman
pontiffs.

tures prevailed also among the Greeks and Lombards, as may be seen in
 the *Oriens Christianus* of LE QUIEN, tom. i. p. 142.

[o] See DE BÜNAU, *Hist. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 28. 32.

[p] HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iv. p. 1236. LE COINTE, *Annales
Eccles. Francor.* tom. vii. ad A. 817. § 6. BALUZII *Capitular. Regum
Francor.* tom. i. p. 591.

[q] MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiast.* p. 54. and
Antiq. Ital. medii ævi, tom. iii. p. 29, 30. in which that learned man
 conjectures, that this edict was forged in the eleventh century. BÜNAU,
Hist. Imper. German. tom. iii. p. 34. The partisans, however, of the
 papal authority, such as FONTANINI and others, plead strenuously,
 though ineffectually for the authenticity of the edict in question.

CENT. IX.

The frauds
practised by
the Roman
pontiffs to in-
crease their
power.

IV. Among the prelates that were raised to the pontificate, in this century, there were very few, who distinguished themselves by their learning, prudence, and virtue, or who were at all careful about acquiring those particular qualities that are essential to the character of a Christian bishop. On the contrary, the greatest part of them are only known by the flagitious actions that have transmitted their names with infamy to our times ; and they all, in general, seem to have vied with each other in their ambitious efforts to extend their authority, and render their dominion unlimited and universal. It is here that we may place, with propriety, an event, which is said to have interrupted the much vaunted succession of regular bishops, in the see of *Rome*, from the first foundation of that church to the present times. Between the pontificate of LEO IV, who died in the year 855, and that of BENEDICT III, a certain woman, who had the art to disguise her sex for a considerable time, is said, by her learning, genius, and dexterity, to have made good her way to the papal chair, and to have governed the church with the title and dignity of pontiff about two years. This extraordinary person is yet known by the title of POPE JOAN. During the five succeeding centuries this event was generally believed, and a vast number of writers bore testimony to its truth ; nor before the reformation undertaken by LUTHER, was it considered by any, either as incredible in itself, or as ignominious to the church [r]. But in the last century, the elevation, and, indeed, the existence of this female pontiff, became the subject of a keen and learned controversy ; and several men of distinguished abilities both among the Roman catholics and protestants, employed all the force of their genius and erudition to destroy the credit of this story, by in-

[r] The arguments of those who maintain the truth of this extraordinary event are collected in one striking point of view with great learning and industry by FRED. SPANHEIM, in his *Exercitatio de Papa Foemina*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 577. This Dissertation was translated into French by the celebrated LENFANT, who digested it into a better method, and enriched it with several additions.

validating,

validating, on the one hand, the weight of the testimonies on which it is founded, and by shewing on the other, that it was inconsistent with the most accurate chronological computations [s]. Between the contending parties, some of the wisest and most learned writers have judiciously steered a middle course: they grant that many fictitious and fabulous circumstances have been interwoven with this story, but they deny that it is entirely destitute of all foundation, or, that the controversy is yet ended, in a satisfactory manner, in favour of those who dispute its truth. And, indeed, upon a deliberate and impartial view of this whole matter, it will appear more than probable, that some unusual event must have happened at *Rome*, from which this story derived its origin; because it is not at all credible, from any principles of moral evidence, that an event should be universally believed and related in the same manner by a multitude of historians, during five centuries immediately succeeding its supposed date, if that event was absolutely destitute of all foundation. But what it was that gave rise to this story, is yet to be discovered, and is likely to remain so [t].

V. The

[s] The arguments of those who reject the story of *Pope Joan* as a fable, have been collected by DAVID BLONDEL, and after him with still more art and erudition by BAYLE, in the third volume of his *Dictionary*, at the article PAGESSE. Add to this JO. GEORG. ECCARD, *Histor. Franciæ Oriental.* tom. ii. lib. xxx. §. 119. p. 436. which author has adopted and appropriated the sentiments of the great LEIBNITZ upon the matter in question. See also LE QUIEN'S *Oriens Christian.* tom. iii. p. 777. and HEUMAN'S *Sylloge. Dissert. Sacrar.* tom. i. part. II. p. 352. The very learned JO. CHRISTOPH. WAGENSELIUS has given a just and accurate view of the arguments on both sides, which may be seen in the *Amoenitates Litterariæ* of SCHELHORN, part. i. p. 146. and the same has been done by BASNAGE, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 408. A list of the other writers, who have employed their labours upon this intricate question, may be seen in CASP. SAGITTARIUS'S *Introd. in Hist. Eccles.* tom. i. cap. xxv. p. 676. and in the *Biblioth. Bremens.* tom. viii. part. V. p. 935.

[t] Such is the opinion of PAUL SARPI, in his *Lettere Italiane*, Lett. lxxxii. p. 452; of LENFANT *Biblioth. Germanique*, tom. x. p. 27; of THEOD. HASÆUS *Biblioth. Bremens.* tom. viii. part. V. p. 935; and of the celebrated PFAFF *Instit. Histor. Eccles.* p. 402; to whom we might

CENT. IX.

The zealous attachment to the kings of *France*, by whom they are favoured.

V. The enormous vices, that must have covered so many pontiffs with infamy in the judgment of the wise, formed not the least obstacle to their ambition in these miserable times, nor hindered them from extending their influence, and augmenting their authority, both in church and state. It does not, indeed, appear from any authentic records, that their possessions augmented in proportion to the progress of their authority, nor that any new grants of land were added to what they had already obtained from the liberality of the kings of *France*. The donations, which LEWIS the MEEK is reported to have made to them, are mere inventions, equally destitute of truth and probability [*u*]; and nothing is more groundless than the accounts of those writers who affirm, that CHARLES the BALD divested himself, in the year 875, of his right to the city of *Rome*, and its territory, in favour of the pontiffs, whom he, at the same time, enriched with a variety of noble and costly presents, in return for the good services of JOHN VIII, by whose succours he was raised to the empire. But be that as it may, it is certain, that the authority and affluence of the bishops of *Rome* increased greatly from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, but more especially from the accession of CHARLES the BALD, to the imperial throne, as all the historical records of that period abundantly testify [*w*].

They gain by the troubles that arise in the empire.

VI. After the death of LEWIS II, a fierce and dreadful war broke out between the posterity of CHARLEMAGNE, among which there were several competitors for the empire. This furnished the Italian princes, and the Roman pontiff JOHN VIII, with a favourable opportunity of assuming to themselves the right of nominating to the imperial throne, and of excluding from all part might add WERNSDORFF, BOECLER, HOLBERG, and many others, were this enumeration necessary. Without assuming the character of a judge in this intricate controversy, concerning which so many false decisions have been pronounced, I shall only take the liberty to observe that the matter in debate is as yet dubious, and has not on either side been represented in such a light as to bring conviction.

[*u*] See above, § 3.

[*w*] BUNAU, *Histor. Imperii Rom. German.* tom. iii. p. 482. JO. GEORGE ECCARD, *Histor. Franciæ Orient.* tom. ii. lib. xxxi. p. 606.

in this election the nations who had formerly the right of suffrage; and if the opportunity was favourable, it was seized with avidity, and improved with the utmost dexterity and zeal. Their favour and interest was earnestly solicited by CHARLES the BALD, whose entreaties were rendered effectual by rich presents, prodigious sums of money, and most pompous promises, in consequence of which he was proclaimed, A. D. 876, by the pontiff JOHN VIII, and by the Italian princes assembled at *Pavia*, king of *Italy*, and emperor of the Romans. CARLOMAN and CHARLES the GROSS, who succeeded him in the kingdom of *Italy*, and in the Roman empire, were also elected by the Roman pontiff, and the Italian princes. After the reigns of these princes the empire was torn in pieces; the most deplorable tumults and commotions arose in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, which were governed, or rather subdued and usurped, by various chiefs, and, in this confused scene of things, the highest bidder was, by the succour of the greedy pontiffs, generally raised to the government of *Italy*, and to the imperial throne [x].

VII. Thus the power and influence of the pontiffs, in civil affairs, arose in a short time to an enormous height through the favour and protection of the princes, in whose cause they had employed the influence, which superstition had given them over the minds of the people. The increase of their authority, in religious matters, was not less rapid, nor less considerable, and it arose from the same causes. The wisest and most impartial among the Roman Catholic writers not only acknowledge, but are even at pains to demonstrate, that from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, the ancient rules of ecclesiastical government were gradually changed in *Europe* by the counsels and instigation of the court of *Rome*, and new laws substituted in their place. The European princes suffered themselves to be divested of the supreme authority in religious matters, which they had derived from CHARLEMAGNE; the power of the bishops

The emperors divested of their ecclesiastical authority, and the power of the councils and of the bishops diminished.

[x] This matter is amply illustrated by SIGONIUS, in his famous book *De Regno Italiae*, and by the other writers of German and Italian history.

was

CENT. IX. was greatly diminished, and even the authority of both provincial and general councils began to decline. The Roman pontiffs, elated with their overgrown prosperity, and become arrogant, beyond measure, by the daily accessions that were made to their authority, were eagerly bent upon persuading all, and had, indeed, the good fortune to persuade many, that the bishop of *Rome* was constituted and appointed by JESUS CHRIST, supreme legislator and judge of the church universal; and that, therefore, the bishops derived all their authority from the Roman pontiff, nor could the councils determine any thing without his permission and consent [y]. This opinion, which was inculcated by the pontiffs with the utmost zeal and ardour, was opposed by such as were acquainted with the ancient ecclesiastical constitutions, and the government of the church in the earlier ages; but it was opposed in vain.

Forged memorials and acts procured by the pontiffs, to establish their supremacy.

VIII. In order to gain credit to this new ecclesiastical code, so different from the ancient rules of church government, and to support the haughty pretensions of the pontiffs to supremacy and independence, it was necessary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to stop the mouths of such as were disposed to set bounds to their usurpations. The bishops of *Rome* were aware of this, and as those means were looked upon as the most lawful that tended best to the accomplishment of their purposes, they employed some of their most ingenious and zealous partisans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epistles and such like records, by which it might appear, that, in the first ages of the church, the Roman pontiffs were cloathed with the same spiritual ma-

[y] See the excellent work of an anonymous and unknown author, who signs himself D. B. and whose book is intitled, *Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique public François*, published first at *London*, in two volumes 8vo, in the year 1737, and lately republished in a larger and more splendid edition. The author of this performance shews, in a judicious and concise manner, the various steps by which the papal authority arose to such a monstrous height. His account of the ninth century may be seen in the first volume of his work, at the 160th page.

jefty,

jeſty, and ſupreme authority which they now aſſumed CENT. IX.
 [z]. Among the fictitious ſupports of the papal dig-
 nity, the famous *decretal epistles*, as they are called, ſaid Decretals.
 to have been written by the pontiffs of primitive times,
 deſerve chiefly to be ſigmatized. They were the pro-
 duction of an obſcure writer, who fraudulently prefixed
 to them the name of ISIDORE, biſhop of *Seville* [a], to
 make the world believe they had been collected by that
 illuſtrious and learned prelate. Some of them had ap-
 peared in the eighth century [b], but they were now en-
 tirely drawn from their obſcurity, and produced, with
 an air of oſtentation and triumph, to demonſtrate the
 ſupremacy of the Roman pontiffs [c]. The deciſions
 of

[z] There is juſt reaſon to imagine, that theſe *Decretals* and various
 other acts, ſuch as the grants of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the
 MEEK, were forged with the knowledge and conſent of the Roman
 pontiffs; ſince it is utterly incredible, that theſe pontiffs ſhould, for ma-
 ny ages, have conſtantly appealed, in ſupport of their pretended rights
 and privileges, to acts and records that were only the fictions of private
 perſons, and ſhould, with ſuch weak arms, have ſtood out againſt kings,
 princes, councils, and biſhops, who were unwilling to receive their
 yoke. Acts of a private nature would have been uſeleſs here, and pub-
 lic deeds were neceſſary to accompliſh the views of papal ambition.
 Such forgeries were, in this century, eſteemed lawful, on account of
 their ſuppoſed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance
 the proſperity of the church: and, therefore, it is not ſurprizing, that
 the good pontiffs ſhould feel no remorse in impoſing upon the world
 frauds and forgeries, that were deſigned to enrich the patrimony of
 St. PETER, and to aggrandize his ſucceſſors in the apoſtolic ſee.

[a] It is certain, that the forger of the *decretals* was extremely de-
 ſirous of perſuading the world, that they were collected by ISIDORE,
 the celebrated biſhop of *Seville*, who lived in the ſixth century. See
 FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 561. It was a cuſtom
 among the biſhops to add, from a principle of humility, the epithet
Peccator, i. e. *Sinner*, to their titles; and, accordingly, the forger of
 the *Decretals* has added the word *Peccator* after the name of ISIDORE;
 but this ſome ignorant tranſcribers have abſurdly changed into the word
Mercator; and hence it happens, that one ISIDORUS *Mercator* paſſes
 for the fraudulent collector, or forger of the *decretals*.

[b] See DON CALMET, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 528. B.
 JUST. HEN. BÖHMER. *Præf. ad novam Edit. Juris Canon.* tom. i. p. x.
 xix. *Not.*

[c] Beſide the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenſes* and other wri-
 ters, the learned BLONDEL has demonſtrated, in an ample and ſatisfac-
 tory

CENT. IX. of a certain Roman council, which is said to have been held during the pontificate of SILVESTER, were likewise alledged in behalf of the same cause; but this council had never been so much as heard of before the present century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the same source with the *decretals*, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandize the Roman pontiffs, and exalt them above all human authority and jurisdiction [d].

The success
of their
frauds.

IX. There were not, however, wanting among the Latin bishops men of prudence and sagacity, who saw through these impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French bishops distinguished themselves, in a particular and glorious manner, by the zeal and vehemence with which they opposed these spurious *decretals*, and other like fictitious monuments and records, and protested against their being received among the laws of the church. But the obstinacy of the pontiffs, and particularly of NICOLAS I, conquered this opposition, and reduced it to silence. And as the empire, in the periods that succeeded this contest, fell back into the grossest ignorance and darkness, there scarcely remained any who were capable of detecting these odious impostures, or disposed to support the expiring liberty of the church. The history of the following ages shews, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the disorders and calamities that sprung from the ambition of the aspiring pontiffs: It represents these despotic lords of the church, labouring by the aid of their impious frauds to

tory manner, the spuriousness of the *decretals*, in his *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*; and in our time the cheat is acknowledged even by the Roman Catholics, at least by such of them as are possessed of any tolerable degree of judgment and impartiality. See BUDDEUS's *Isagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 762; as also PETR. COUSTANTIUS his *Prolegom. ad Epistolas Pontificum*, tom. i. p. 130; and a *Dissertation* of FLEURY, prefixed to the sixteenth volume of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

[d] See JO. LAUNOIUS, *De cura Ecclesiæ erga pauperes et miseros*, cap. i. Observat. i. p. 576. tom. ii. part. II. Opp.

over-

overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its bishops, to engross its riches and revenues into their own hands, nay, what is still more horrible, it represents them aiming, perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to lessen their power, and to set bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimously acknowledged by such as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the history of the times of which we now write, and is ingenuously confessed by men of learning and probity, that are well affected to the Romish church and its sovereign pontiff [e].

X. The monastic life was now universally in the highest esteem, and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid to such as devoted themselves to the sacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accustomed to regard the monkish orders and discipline with the greatest admiration; but it was only since the beginning of the last century, that this holy passion was indulged among the Latins to such an extravagant length. In the present age it went beyond all bounds: kings, dukes, and counts forgot their true dignity, even the fulfilling with zeal the duties of their high stations, and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they took for magnanimity, though it was really nothing else but the result of a narrow and superstitious spirit. They abandoned their thrones, their honours, and their treasures, and shut themselves up in monasteries with a view of devoting themselves entirely to God. Several examples of this fanatical extravagance were exhibited in *Italy, France, Germany, and Spain*, both in this and the preceding century. And if the allurements of worldly pleasures and honours had too much power over the minds of many to permit their separating themselves from human society, during their lives, such endeavoured to make amends for this in their last hours; for when they perceived death ap-

The monastic life in high repute.

[e] See the abovementioned author's treatise, entitled, *Regia Petestas in Causis Matrimonial.* tom. i. part. II. Opp. p. 764. as also PETR. COUSTANTIUS, *Præf. ad Epist. Romanor. Pontif.* tom. i. p. 127.

CENT. IX. proaching, they demanded the monastic habit, and actually put it on before their departure, that they might be regarded as of the fraternity; and be of consequence entitled to the fervent prayers and other spiritual succours of their ghostly brethren.

Monks and abbots employed in civil affairs, and called to the courts of princes.

But nothing affords such a striking and remarkable proof of the excessive and fanatical veneration that was paid to the Monastic order, as the treatment they received from several kings and emperors, who drew numbers of monks and abbots from their cloisters, and placed them in stations entirely foreign to their vows and their character, even amidst the splendor of a court, and at the head of affairs. The transition, indeed, was violent from the obscurity of a convent and the study of a liturgy, to sit at the helm of an empire, and manage the political interests of nations. But such was the case, and pious princes alledged as a reason for this singular choice, that the government of a state could never be better placed than in the hands of such holy men; who had subdued all irregular appetites and passions, and were so divested of the lust of pleasure, and ambition, as to be incapable of any unworthy designs, any low, sordid or selfish views. Hence we find in the history of those times frequent examples of monks and abbots performing the functions of ambassadors, envoys, and ministers of state, and displaying their talents with various success in these high and eminent stations.

A reformation of the monastic order attempted.

XI. The morals, however, of the monks were far from being so pure as to justify the reason alledged above for their promotion. Their patrons and protectors, who loaded them with honours and preferment, were sensible of the irregular and licentious lives that many of them led, and used their utmost efforts to correct their vices and to reform their manners. **LEWIS** the **MEEK** distinguished his zeal in the execution of this virtuous and noble design; and to render it more effectual, he employed the pious labours of **BENEDICT**, abbot of *Aniane*, in reforming the monasteries first in *Aquitaine*, and afterwards throughout the whole kingdom of *France*, and in restoring, by new and salutary laws, the monastic

stic discipline which was absolutely neglected and fallen into decay. This worthy ecclesiastic presided in the year 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, where several wise measures were taken for removing the disorders that reigned in the cloisters; and in consequence of the unlimited authority, he had received from the emperor, he subjected all the monks, without exception, to the rule of the famous BENEDICT abbot of *Mount Cassin*, annulled that variety of rites and customs that had obtained in the different monasteries, prescribed to them all one uniform method of living, and thus united, as it were, into one general body or society, the various orders which had hitherto been connected by no common bond [f]. This admirable discipline, which acquired to BENEDICT of *Aniane*, the highest reputation, and made him be revered as the second father of the western monks, flourished during a certain time; but afterwards declined through various causes, until the conclusion of this century, when under the calamities that oppressed both the church and the empire, it almost entirely disappeared.

XII. The same emperor, who had appeared with such zeal both in protecting and reforming the monks, gave also distinguished marks of his favour to the order of *canons*, which CHRODEGANGUS had introduced in several places during the last century. He distributed them through all the provinces of the empire, and instituted also an order of *canonesses*, which was the first female convent known in the Christian world [g]. For each of these orders the zealous emperor had a rule drawn up A. D. 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, which he substituted in the place of that which had been appointed by CHRODEGANGUS, and this new rule

Canons and
canonesses.

[f] JO. MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. iv. part. I. Præf. p. xxvii. and Præf. ad Sæc. v. p. xxv. EJUSDEM, Annales Ordin. S. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 430. CALMET, Hist. de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 596. For a particular account of BENEDICT of Aniane, and his illustrious virtues, see the Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Febr. p. 606; and the Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 447.*

[g] See MABILLON, *Annal. Ordin. S. Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 428.

CENT. IX. was observed in the most of the monasteries and convents of the canons and canoneses in the west until the XII century, notwithstanding that it was disapproved of by the court of *Rome* [b]. The author of the rule that was appointed for the *canons* was, undoubtedly, AMALARIUS, a presbyter of *Metz*; but it is not so certain whether that which was drawn up for the *canoneses* was composed by the same hand [i]. Be that as it may, the *canonical* order grew into high repute; and from this time a great number of convents were erected for them through all the western provinces, and were richly endowed by the liberality of pious and opulent Christians. But this institution degenerated in a short time, like all others, from its primitive purity, and ceased to answer the laudable intention and design of its worthy founders [k].

The principal Greek writers.

XIII. Of the theological writers that flourished among the Greeks, the following are the most remarkable:

PHOTIUS, patriarch of *Constantinople*, a man of most

[b] This rule was condemned in a council held at *Rome*, A. D. 1059, under the pontiff NICHOLAS II. The pretexts used by the pontiff and the assembled prelates, to justify their disapprobation of this rule, were, that it permitted the canons to enjoy the possessions they had before their vows, and allowed to each of them too large a portion of bread and wine; but the true reason was, that this order had been instituted by an emperor without either the consent, or knowledge, of the Roman pontiff. For an account of the rule and discipline of these *canons*, see FLEURY'S *Eccles. Hist.* tom. x. p. 163, 164, &c. *Brussels* edition in 12mo.

[i] LUD. THOMASSIN. *Disciplin. Eccles. Vet. et Novæ*, part I. lib. iii. cap. xlii, xliii. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 185. 540. No accounts of the *Canons* are less worthy of credit, than those that are given by writers, who have been themselves members of that order, such as RAYMOND CHAPPONEI'S *Histoire des Chanoines*, published at *Paris* in 8vo in the year 1699; for these writers, from fond prejudices in favour of their institution, and an ambitious desire of enhancing its merit and rendering it respectable, derive the origin of *canonical order* from CHRIST and his apostles, or trace it up, at least, to the first ages of the Christian church.

[k] CALMET, *Hist. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 591. *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 536.

profound

profound and universal erudition; whose *Bibliotheca* [I], *Epistles*, and other writings, are yet valuable on many accounts. CENT. IX.

NICEPHORUS, also patriarch of the abovementioned city, who, among other productions, published a warm defence of the worship of images against the enemies of that idolatrous service [m].

THEODORUS STUDITES, who acquired a name, chiefly by his opposition to the *Iconoclasts*, and by the zeal with which he wrote in favour of image-worship [n].

The same cause has principally contributed to transmit to after ages the names of THEODORUS GRAPTUS, METHODIUS, who obtained the title of *Confessor* for his adherence to image-worship in the very face of persecution, THEODORUS ABUCARA [o], PETRUS SICULUS, NICETAS DAVID, and others, who would probably have been long since buried in oblivion, had not the various contests between the Greek and Latin churches, and the divisions of the former among themselves upon the question concerning images, excited the vehemence of these inconsiderable writers, and furnished them with an occasion of making some noise in the world.

MOSES BARCEPHA, a Syrian bishop, surpassed by far all whom we have now been mentioning, and deserved the shining reputation, which he has obtained in the republic of letters, as what we have yet extant of his works discover several marks of true genius, and an uncommon acquaintance with the art of writing [p].

[I] See CAMUSAT, *Histoire des Journaux*, tom. i. p. 87.

[m] *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. Martii ad d. xiii. p. 293. OUDINUS, *Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 2.

[n] THEODORE STUDITES was one of the most voluminous writers of this century, and would certainly have been known as a man of genius and learning to after ages, though the controversy concerning images had never existed. There are of his writings yet extant, 265 letters, several treatises against the *Iconoclasts*, 124 epigrams in Iambics, and a large manuscript, which contains a course of catechetical instruction concerning the duties of the monastic life.]

[o] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the article ABUCARA.

[p] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 127.

CENT. IX.

Latin writers.

XIV. RABANUS MAURUS, archbishop of *Mentz*, is deservedly placed at the head of the Latin writers of this age; the force of his genius, the extent of his knowledge, and the multitude of productions that flowed from his pen, entitle him to this distinguished rank, and render improper all comparison between him and his cotemporaries. He may be called the great light of *Germany* and *France*, since it was from the prodigious fund of knowledge he possessed, that these nations derived principally their religious instruction. His writings were every where in the hands of the learned [q], and were held in such veneration, that, during four centuries, the most eminent of the Latin divines appealed to them as authority in religious matters, and adopted almost universally the sentiments they contained. After this illustrious prelate, the writers that are most worthy of mention are,

AGOBARD, archbishop of *Lyons*, a man of wisdom and prudence, and far from being destitute of literary merit; but whose reputation has deservedly suffered by his justifying and even fomenting the rebellion of *LOTHAIRE* and *PEPIN* against *LEWIS* the MEEK, their father and their sovereign [r].

HILDUIN, abbot of *St. Dennis*, who acquired no small reputation by a work entitled, *Areopagitica* [s].

EGINHARD, abbot of *Selingestat*, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, remarkable for the beauty of his diction, the perspicuity and elegance of his style, and a variety of other literary accomplishments [t].

[q] See, for a particular account of the life and writings of RABANUS MAURUS, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 151; as also the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Febr. p. 500.

[r] See COLONIA, *Hist. Litter. de la ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 93: *General Dictionary*, at the article AGOBARD. *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 567. [AGOBARD opposed with great zeal both the worship and the use of images, in his famous book *De picturis et imaginibus*, a work which has greatly embarrassed the doctors of the Romish church.]

[s] *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 607.

[t] *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 550. See also the *Life of Charlemagne*, of which the best of fourteen editions is that published by SCHMINKIUS, at *Utrecht*, in the year 1711.

CLAUDIUS

CLAUDIUS, bishop of *Turin*, whose *Exposition* of several books of scripture [u], as also his *Chronology* gained him an eminent and lasting reputation [w].

FRECULF, bishop of *Lysieux*, whose *Chronicle*, which is no more than a heavy compilation, is yet extant.

SERVATUS LUPUS, of whose composition we have several epistles and treatises; and who, though a copious and subtle writer, is yet defective in point of elegance and erudition [x].

DREPANIUS FLORUS, who left behind him several *Poems*, *An exposition of certain books of scripture*, and other performances less worthy of attention [y].

CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, the author of *A commentary upon St. Matthew's Gospel* [z].

GODESCHALC, a monk of *Orbais*, who rendered his name immortal by the controversy which he set on foot concerning *Predestination and Free Grace*.

PASCHASIUS RADBERT [a], a name famous in the contests concerning *The real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist*; and who, to pass in silence his other writings, composed a book upon this very subject, which furnished abundant matter of dispute throughout this century.

BERTRAM, or RATRAMN, a monk of *Corby*, who deserves the first rank among the writers that refuted the doctrine of RADBERT; and whose book concerning *The sacrament of the Lord's supper*, which was composed by

[(u) This prelate, who was famous for his knowledge of the holy scriptures, composed III books of commentaries upon *Genesis*, IV upon *Exodus*, and several upon *Leviticus*. He wrote also a commentary upon the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, in which there are many excellent things, and an exposition of all the *Epistles of St. Paul*. His commentary on the *Epistle to the Galatians* is printed, but all the rest are in manuscript.]

[w] See SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. de M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 284.

[x] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 255.

[y] COLONIA, *Histoire Litt. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 135. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 213.

[z] *Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 84.

[a] For an account of RADBERT, see the *Histoire Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 287.

CENT. IX. the order of CHARLES the BALD, gave also occasion to many contests among learned divines [b].

HAYMO, bishop of *Halberstadt*, the laborious author of several treatises upon various subjects, and who is more to be esteemed for his industry and diligence, than for his genius and learning [c].

WALAFRIDUS STRABO, who acquired no mean reputation by his *Poems*, his *Lives of the saints*, and his *Explications* of many of the more difficult passages of scripture [d].

HINCMAR, archbishop of *Rheims*, a man of an imperious and turbulent spirit; but who deserves, notwithstanding, a distinguished place among the Latin writers of this century, since his works discover an aspiring genius, and an ardent zeal in the pursuit of truth, and tend, moreover, in a singular manner, to throw light both upon the civil and ecclesiastical history of the age in which he lived [e].

JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, an eminent philosopher, and a learned divine, whose erudition was accompanied with uncommon marks of sagacity and genius, and whose various performances, as well as his translations from the Greek, gained him a shining and lasting reputation [f].

It is sufficient barely to name REMIGIUS BERTHARIUS, ADO, AIMOIN HERIC, REGINO, abbot of *Prum*, and others, of whom the most common writers of ecclesiastical history give ample accounts.

[b] We shall have occasion to speak more particularly of BERTRAM and his book, in the following chapter.

[c] It is proper to observe, that a great part of the writings that are attributed to HAYMO, bishop of *Halberstadt*, were composed by REMI, or REMIGIUS, of *Auxerre*. See CASIMIR OUDINUS, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 330. *Histoire Littéraire de la France* tom. v. p. 111. tom. vi. p. 106. LE BEUF, *Recueil de Diff. sur l'Histoire de la France*, tom. i. p. 278.

[d] See the *Histoire Littér. de la France*, tom. v. p. 544.

[e] *Ibid.* tom. v. p. 416

[f] See HERM. CONRINGIUS, *Antiq. Academicæ*, p. 309. *Histoire Littér. de la France*, tom. v. p. 416.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church in this century

I. **T**HE zeal of CHARLEMAGNE for the interests of Christianity, and his liberality to the learned, encouraged many to apply themselves diligently to the study of the scriptures, and to the pursuit of religious truth; and as long as this eminent set of divines remained, the western provinces were happily preserved from many errors, and from a variety of superstitious practices. Thus we find among the writers of this age several men of eminent talents, whose productions shew that the lustre of true erudition and theology was not as yet, totally eclipsed. But these illustrious luminaries of the church disappeared one after the other, and barbarism and ignorance, encouraged by their departure, resumed their ancient seats, and brought in their train a prodigious multitude of devout follies, odious superstitions, and abominable errors. Nor did any encourage and propagate with more zeal and ardor these superstitious innovations, than the sacerdotal orders, the spiritual guides of a deluded people. And if we enquire how it came to pass, that the clergy were so zealous in such an inglorious cause, we shall find that this zeal was, in some, the effect of ignorance, and, in others, the fruit of avarice and ambition; since much was to be gained both in point of authority and opulence from the progress of superstition. Christianity among the Greeks and Orientals was almost in the same declining and deplorable state; though there arose, from time to time, in the eastern provinces, men of superior abilities, who endeavoured to support the cause of true religion, and to raise it from the pressures under which it laboured.

The miserable state of Christianity.

II. The causes of this unhappy revolution, that covered the Christian church with superstition and darkness, will appear evident to such as are at all acquainted

The causes to which it was owing.

CENT. IX. ed with the history of those times. The Oriental doctors, miserably divided among themselves, and involved in the bitterest contentions and quarrels with the western churches, lost all notion of the true spirit and genius of Christianity, and, corrupted and biassed by the prejudices and passions, that are generally excited and nourished by ill-managed controversy, became incapable of promoting the true and essential interests of religion. Intent also upon defending the excellence and divine authority of their doctrine and discipline against the Latin doctors, and in maintaining among themselves the worship of images which began to be warmly opposed, they advanced many things in the course of these disputes, that were highly erroneous, and as one error follows another, their number increased from day to day. The savage and unnatural lives of the monks and hermits, whose number was prodigious, and whose authority was considerable, who haunted the woods and deserts, the gloomy scenes of their extravagant devotion, contributed much, among other causes, to the decay of solid and rational piety. Add to all this, the irruptions of the barbarous nations into the west, the atrocious exploits of usurping princes, the drooping and neglected condition of all the various branches of learning, the ambitious frenzy of the Roman pontiffs, who were incessantly gaping after new accessions of authority and dominion, the frauds and tricks of the monastic orders carried on under the specious mask of religion, and then we shall see the true causes that founded the empire of superstition and error upon the ruins of virtue, piety and reason.

The corrupt ignorance and superstition that reigned in this century appear even in the single instance of the foolish veneration that was paid to the saints and their relics.

III. The ignorance and corruption that dishonoured the Christian church, in this century, were great beyond measure; and were there no other examples of their enormity upon record, than the single instance of that stupid veneration that was paid to the bones and carcases of departed saints; this would be sufficient to convince us of the deplorable progress of superstition. This idolatrous devotion was now considered as the most sacred and momentous branch of religion, nor did any

any dare to entertain the smallest hopes of finding the Deity propitious, before they had assured themselves of the protection and intercession of some one or other of the saintly order. Hence it was that every church, and indeed every private Christian had their particular patron among the saints, from an apprehension that their spiritual interests would be but indifferently managed by those, who were already employed about the souls of others; for they judged, in this respect, of the saints as they did of mortals, whose capacity is too limited to comprehend a vast variety of objects. This notion rendered it necessary to multiply prodigiously the number of the saints, and to create daily new patrons for the deluded people; and this was done with the utmost zeal. The priests and monks set their invention at work, and peopled, at discretion, the invisible world with imaginary protectors. They dispelled the thick darkness, which covered the pretended spiritual exploits of many holy men; and they invented both names and histories of saints [g] that never existed, that they might not be at a loss to furnish the credulous and wretched multitude with objects proper to perpetuate their superstition and to nourish their confidence. Many chose their own guides, and committed their spiritual interests either to phantoms of their own creation, or to distracted fanatics whom they esteemed as saints, for no other reason than their having lived like madmen.

IV. The ecclesiastical councils found it necessary, at length, to set limits to the licentious superstition of those ignorant wretches, who, with a view to have still more friends at court, for such were their gross notions of things, were daily adding new saints to the list of their celestial mediators. They, accordingly, declared by a solemn decree that no departed Christian should be considered as a member of the saintly order before the bi-

The saints
canonized.

[(g) See Dr. MIDDLETON's letter from *Rome, passim*, in which we find the names of St. BACCHO, St. VIAR, St. AMPHIBOLUS, EUODIA, &c.]

CENT. IX. shop in a provincial council, and in the presence of the people had pronounced him worthy of that distinguished honour [b]. This remedy, feeble and illusory as it was, contributed, in some measure, to restrain the fanatical temerity of the saint-makers; but, in its consequences, it was the occasion of a new accession of power to the Roman pontiff. Even so early as this century many were of opinion, that it was proper and expedient, though not absolutely necessary, that the decision of bishops and councils should be confirmed by the consent and authority of the Roman pontiff, whom they considered as the supreme and universal bishop; and this will not appear surprizing to any who reflect upon the enormous strides, which the bishops of *Rome* made towards unbounded dominion in this barbarous and superstitious age, whose corruption and darkness were peculiarly favourable to their ambitious pretensions. It is true, we have no example of any person solemnly sainted by the bishops of *Rome* alone, before the xth century [i], when UDALRIC, bishop of *Augsburg*, received this dignity in a formal manner from JOHN XV. It is however certain, that before that time, the Roman pontiffs were consulted in matters of that nature, and their judgment respected in the choice of those, that were to be honoured with saintship [k]; and it was by such steps as these, that the church of *Rome* engrossed to itself the creation of these tutelary divinities, which

[b] MABILLON, *Acta. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. v. Præf.* p. 44. LAUNOY, *De Lazari, Magdalene, et Marthæ in Provinciam apulsum*, cap. i. § 12. p. 342. tom. ii. part. I. Opp. FRANC. PAGI *Breviarium Pontiff. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 259. tom. iii. p. 30.

[i] See DAN. PAPEBROCHIUS, *De solennium canonisationum initiis et progress. in Propylæo Actor. SS. mens. Maii*, p. 171; and the other authors who have written upon this subject, of which there is an ample list in the *Bibliographia Antiquar.* of FABRICIUS, cap. vii. § 25. p. 270.

[k] See the candid and impartial account that is given of this matter by the late pope BENEDICT XIV, in his laborious work, *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 50. tom. i. Opp. edit. *Roman.* It were to be wished, that historians of the church of *Rome* would learn to imitate the prudence, moderation, and equity of that illustrious pontiff.

at length, was distinguished by the title of *Canonization*. CENT. IX.

V. This preposterous multiplication of saints was a new source of abuses and frauds. It was thought necessary to write the lives of these celestial patrons, in order to procure for them the veneration and confidence of a deluded multitude; and here lying wonders were invented, and all the resources of forgery and fable exhausted to celebrate exploits that never had been performed, and to perpetuate the memory of holy persons who had never existed. We have yet extant a prodigious quantity of these trifling legends, the greatest part of which were, undoubtedly, forged after the time of CHARLEMAGNE by the monastic writers, who had both the inclination and leisure to edify the church by these pious frauds. The same impostors, who peopled the celestial regions with fictitious saints, employed also their fruitful inventions in embellishing with false miracles, and various other impertinent forgeries, the history of those, who had been really martyrs or confessors in the cause of CHRIST; these fictions, however, did not pass with impunity, but were severely censured by some of the most eminent writers of the times in which they were imposed upon the credulity of the public [1]. Various were the motives that engaged different persons to propagate, or countenance, these impostures. Some were excited to this by the seductions of a false devotion, which reigned in this perverse and ignorant age, and made them imagine that departed saints were highly delighted with the applauses and veneration of mortals, and never failed to crown with peculiar marks

[1] See SERVATUS LUPUS's *Vita Maximini*, p. 275, 276. and the candid and learned observations upon this subject that are to be found in various places of the works of the celebrated LAUNOY; e. g. in his *Disputatio Epistolæ Petri de Marca, de tempore quo in Gallia Christi fides recepta*, cap. xiv. p. 110. in his *Dissertationes de primis Christianæ relig. in Gallia initiis*, Diff. ii. p. 142. 144. 145. 147. 168, 169. 181.—*De Lazari, Magdal. et Marthæ in Galliam appulsi*, p. 340.—*De Duobus Dionysiis*, p. 527. 529, 530. tom. ii. part. I. Opp.—See also MARTENE's *Thesaurus Anecdotor*, tom. i. p. 151.—*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 273.

CENT. IX. of their favour and protection such as were zealous in honouring their memories, and in celebrating their exploits. The prospect of gain, and the ambitious desire of being revered by the multitude, engaged others to multiply the number and to maintain the credit of the legends, or faintly registers. For the churches, that were dedicated to the saints, were perpetually crowded with supplicants, who flocked to them with rich presents in order to obtain succour under the afflictions they suffered, or deliverance from the dangers which they had reason to apprehend. And it was esteemed also a high honour to be the more immediate ministers of these tutelary mediators, who, as it is likewise proper to observe, were esteemed and frequented in proportion to their antiquity, and to the number and importance of the pretended miracles that had rendered their lives illustrious. This latter circumstance offered a strong temptation, to such as were employed by the various churches in writing the lives of their tutelar saints, to supply by invention the defects of truth, and to embellish their legends with fictitious prodigies; nay, they were not only tempted to this imposture, but were even obliged to make use of it in order to swell the fame of their respective patrons [m].

A passionate
fondness for
their relics
prevails.

VI. But even all this was insufficient to satisfy the demands of superstition nourished by the stratagems of a corrupt and designing priesthood, and fomented by the zeal of the more ignorant and stupid sons of the church. It was not enough to reverence departed saints, and to confide in their intercession and succours; it was not enough to cloath them with an imaginary power of healing diseases, working miracles, and delivering from all sorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their cloaths, the apparel, and furniture they had possessed during their lives, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrified carcases were

[m] Of all the lives of the saints written in this century, none are more liable to suspicion than those drawn up by the Britons and Normans. See MABILLON *Præf. ad Sæc. i. Benedictin. sub init.*

laid,

laid, were treated with a stupid veneration, and supposed to retain the marvellous virtue of healing all disorders both of body and mind, and of defending such as possessed them against all the assaults and devices of satan. The consequence of this wretched notion was, that every one was eager to provide himself with these salutary remedies, for which purpose great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and subjected themselves to all sorts of hardships; while others made use of this delusion, to accumulate their riches, and to impose upon the miserable multitude by the most impious and shocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and universal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to satisfy these demands, and were far from being nice in the methods they used for that end. The bodies of the saints were sought by fasting and prayer instituted by the priest in order to obtain a divine answer, and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accomplish their desires; the holy carcase was always found, and that always in consequence, as they impiously gave out, of the suggestion, and inspiration of God himself. Each discovery of this kind was attended with excessive demonstrations of joy, and animated the zeal of these devout seekers to enrich the church still more and more with this new kind of treasure. Many travelled with this view into the eastern provinces, and frequented the places, which CHRIST and his disciples had honoured with their presence, that, with the bones and other sacred remains of the first heralds of the gospel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling consciences, save sinking states, and defend their inhabitants from all sorts of calamities. Nor did these pious travellers return home empty; the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks found a rich prey in the stupid credulity of the Latin relic-hunters, and made a profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid considerable sums for legs and arms, skulls and jaw bones (several of which were Pagan, and some not human) and other things that were supposed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Christian church;

CENT. IX. church; and thus the Latin churches came to the possession of those celebrated relics of St. MARK, St. JAMES, St. BARTHOLOMEW, CYPRIAN, PANTALEON, and others, which they shew at this day with so much ostentation. But there were many, who, unable to procure for themselves these spiritual treasures by voyages and prayers, had recourse to violence and theft; for all sorts of means and all sorts of attempts in a cause of this nature were considered, when successful, as pious and acceptable to the supreme being [n].

The exposition of the scriptures neglected among the Greeks.

VII. The study of the holy scriptures languished much among the Greeks in this century. PHOTIUS, who composed a book of *Questions* [o], relating to various passages of scripture, *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. PAUL*, and other productions of the same nature [p], was one of the few that employed their talents in the illustration of the sacred writings. He was a man of great sagacity and genius, who preferred the dictates of reason to the decisions of authority; notwithstanding all which, he cannot be recommended as a model to other commentators. The other Greek writers, who attempted to explain the holy scriptures, did little more than compile and accumulate various passages from the commentators of the proceeding ages; and this method was the origin of those *Catene*, or chains of commentaries; so much in vogue among the Greeks during this century, of which a considerable number have

[n] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 6. who gives examples of the truth of this assertion.

[o] This work, which is intitled *Amphilochia*, from its having been addressed to AMPHILOCHIUS, bishop of *Cyzicum*, consists of 308 questions and answers to them, a sixth part of which, at least, are to be found in the *Epistles of Photius*, published at London in 1651, by bishop MONTAGUE. The most of these questions relate to different texts of the *Old and New Testament*; but these are interpersed with others of a philosophical and literary kind. This work is still extant in MSS in the Vatican, Barberinian, and Bavarian libraries.]

[p] Such as a *catena*, or *chain*, of commentaries on the book of *Psalms*, compiled from the writings of ATHANASIUS, BASIL, CHRYSOSTOM, &c. and a commentary upon the *Prophets*, both of which are yet extant in MSS, the former in the *Bibliotheca Segueriana*, or *Coisliniana*, and the latter in the Vatican library.]

come

come down to our times, and which consisted entirely CENT. IX.
 in a collection of the explications of the scripture that
 were scattered up and down in the ancient writers.
 The greatest part of the theological writers, finding
 themselves incapable of more arduous undertakings,
 confined their labours to this compiling method to the
 great detriment of sacred criticism.

VIII. The Latin commentators were vastly superior
 in number to those among the Greeks, which was owing
 to the zeal and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, who,
 both by his liberality and by his example, had excited
 and encouraged the doctors of the preceding age to the
 study of the scriptures. Of these expositors there were
 two at least who are worthy of esteem, CHRISTIAN
 DRUTHMAR, whose *Commentary on St. MATTHEW*, is
 come down to our times [q]; and the abbot BERTHA-
 RIUS, whose *Two Books concerning Fundamentals*, are
 also said to be yet extant. The rest seem unequal to
 the important office of sacred critics, and may be di-
 vided into two classes, which we have had already oc-
 casion to mention in the course of this history; the class
 of those, who merely collected and reduced into a mass
 the opinions and explications of the ancients, and that
 of a fantastic set of expositors, who were always hunt-
 ing after mysteries in the plainest expressions, and la-
 bouring to deduce a variety of abstruse and hidden sig-
 nifications from every passage of scripture, all which
 they did for the most part in a very clumsy and un-
 couth manner. At the head of the first class was RA-
 BANUS MAURUS, who acknowledges that he borrowed
 from the ancient doctors the materials he made use of
 in illustrating the Gospel of St. MATTHEW, and the Epi-
 stles of St. PAUL; WALAFRID STRABO, who borrow-
 ed explications chiefly from RABANUS; CLAUDIUS of
 Turin, who trod in the foot-steps of AUGUSTIN and

Defects of
 the Latin
 commenta-
 tors.

[q] See R. SIMON, *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs, du
 Nouv. Testament.* chap. xxv. p. 348; as also his *Critique de la Bibli-
 otheque Ecclesiastique de M. du Pin*, tom. i. p. 293. who, in his xxvith
 and xxviith chapter, gives an account of most of the writers mentioned
 here.

CENT. IX. ORIGEN; HINCMAR, whose *Expositions of the IV Books of Kings* compiled from the fathers, are yet extant; REMIGIUS of *Auxerre*, who derived from the same source his illustrations on the *Psalms*, and other books of sacred writ: SEDULIUS, who explained in the same manner the Epistles of St. PAUL; FLORUS, HAYMO bishop of *Halberstadt*, and others, whom, for the sake of brevity, we pass in silence.

Allegorists.

IX. RABANUS MAURUS, whom we introduced above at the head of the compilers of the fathers, deserves also an eminent place among the allegorical commentators, on account of his diffuse and tedious work, entitled *Scripture Allegories*. To this class also belong SMARAGDUS, HAYMO, SCOTUS, PASCHASIUS RADBERT, and many others, whom it is not necessary to mention. The fundamental and general principal, in which also the writers of this class agree, is, that, besides the literal signification of each passage in scripture, there are hidden and deep senses which escape the vulgar eye; but they are not agreed about the number of these mysterious significations. Some attribute to every phrase three senses; others four; others again five; nay, their number is carried to seven by ANGELOME, a monk of *Lysieux*, an acute, though fantastic writer, and who is far from deserving the meanest rank among the expounders of this century [r].

The state of didactic theology.

X. The teachers of theology were still more contemptible than the commentators, and the Greeks, as well as the Latins, were extremely negligent both in unfolding the nature, and proving the truth of the doctrines of Christianity. Their method of inculcating divine truth was dry, and unsatisfactory, and more adapted to fill the memory with sentences, than to enlighten the understanding, or to improve the judgment. The Greeks, for the most part, followed implicitly DA-

[r] See the Preface to his *Commentary on the book of Kings*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, tom. xv. p. 308. The commentary of ANGELOME upon the book of *Genesis*, was published by BERNARD PEZIUS, in his *Tesaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. i. part. I. but, indeed the loss would not have been great had it never seen the light.

MASCENUS, while the Latins submitted their hood-CENT. IX.
winked intellects to the authority of AUGUSTINE. Au-
thority became the test of truth, and supplied in arro-
gance what it wanted in argument. That magisterial
decisions were employed in the place of reason appears
manifestly from the *Collectaneum de tribus Quæstionibus*,
of SERVATUS LUPUS; and also from a *Treatise* of RE-
MIGIUS, concerning the necessity of holding fast the truths
of the gospel, and of maintaining inviolable the sacred au-
thority of the holy and orthodox fathers. If any deigned
to appeal to the authority of the scriptures in defence of
their systems, they either explained them in an allego-
rical manner, or, understood them in the sense that had
been given them by the decrees of councils, or in the
writings of the fathers; from which senses they thought
it both unlawful and impious to depart. The Irish doc-
tors alone, and particularly JOHANNES SCOTUS, had the
courage to spurn the ignominious fetters of authority,
and to explain the sublime doctrines of Christianity in
a manner conformable to the dictates of reason, and
the principles of true philosophy. But this noble at-
tempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a supersti-
tious age, and exposed them to the hatred of the Latin
theologians, who would not permit either reason or phi-
losophy to meddle themselves in religious matters [s].

XI. The important science of morals suffered, like Of Christian
morality.
all others, in the hands of ignorant and unskilful writ-
ters. The labours of some were wholly employed in
collecting from the fathers an indigested heap of max-
ims and sentences concerning religious and moral du-
ties, and such, among others was the work of ALVA-
RUS, entitled *Scintillæ Patrum*. Others wrote in a more
systematic manner concerning virtue and vice, such as
HALITGARIUS, RABANUS MAURUS, and JONAS, bi-
shop of Orleans; but the representations they gave of the

[s] For an account of the persecution and hatred that JOHANNES SCOTUS suffered in the cause of reason and liberty, see DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 182; as also MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. v.* 392.

CENT. IX. one and the other were very different from those which we find in the gospel of CHRIST. Others again, fell into that most absurd and delusive method of instructing the ignorant in the will of God by a fantastic combination of figures and allegories; and several of the Greeks began to turn their studies towards the resolving *cases of conscience* [t], in order to remove the difficulties that arose in scrupulous and timorous minds. We pass in silence the writers of homilies and books of penance, of which there was a considerable number in this century.

The progress
of mysticism.

XII. The doctrine of the mystics, whose origin is falsely attributed to DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, and whose precepts were designed to elevate the soul above all sensible and terrestrial objects, and to unite it to the deity in an ineffable manner, had been now for a long time in vogue among the Greeks, and more especially among the monastic orders. And to augment the credit of this fanatical sect, and multiply its followers MICHAEL SYNCELLUS and METHODIUS, composed the most pompous and eloquent panegyricks upon the memory of DIONYSIUS, in which his virtues were celebrated with the utmost exaggeration. The Latins were not as yet bewitched with the specious appearance, and the illusory charms of the mystic devotion, which was equally adapted to affect persons of a lively fancy, and those of a more gloomy turn of mind. They lived in a happy ignorance of this contagious doctrine, when the Grecian emperor MICHAEL BALBUS sent to LEWIS the MEEK, in the year 824, a copy of the pretended works [u] of DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, which fatal present kindled immediately the holy flame of mysticism in the

[t] See NICEPHORI *Chartophylac. Epistolæ Duæ*, in the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*, tom. iii. p. 413.

[u] USSERII *Sylloge Epp. Hibernicar.* p. 54, 55. [The spuriousness of these works is now universally granted by the most learned and impartial of the Roman catholic writers, as they contain accounts of many events that happened several ages after the time of DIONYSIUS, and were not at all mentioned until after the fifth century. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.* livr. liv. tom. xi. p. 520. edit. *Bruxelles.*]

western provinces, and filled the Latins with the most CENT. IX. enthusiastic admiration of this new religion. The translation of these spurious works into Latin by the express order of the emperor [w], who could not be easy while his subjects were deprived of such an inestimable treasure, contributed much to the progress of the mysticism. By the order of the same emperor, HILDUIN, abbot of *St. Denys*, composed an account of the life, actions, and writings of DIONYSIUS, under the title of *Areopagitica*, in which work, among other impudent fictions, usual in those times of superstition and imposture, he maintained, in order to exalt the honour of his nation, that DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, and DIONYSIUS, bishop of *Paris*, were one and the same person [x]. This fable, which was invented with unparalleled assurance, was received with the most perfect and unthinking credulity, and made such a deep and permanent impression upon the minds of the French, that the repeated demonstrations of its falshood have not as yet been sufficient to ruin its credit entirely. As the first translation of the works of DIONYSIUS, that had been done by the order of LEWIS the MEEK, was probably in a barbarous

[w] That these books were translated by the order of LEWIS, appears manifestly from the *Epistle* to that emperor, which HILDUIN prefixed to his *Areopagitica*, and in which (p. 66. edit. *Colon.* 1563.) we find the following passage: *De notitia librorum, quos (Dionysius) patrio sermone conscripsit, et quibus petentibus illos composuit, lectio nobis per Dei gratiam et vestram ordinationem, CUJUS DISPENSATIONE INTERPRETATOS, scrinia nostra eos petentibus referat, satisfacit.* From this passage it is evident that they are mistaken, who affirm that the Latin translation of the works of DIONYSIUS was not made before the time of CHARLES the BALD. And they err also, who, with MABILLON, *Annal. Benedi.* tom. ii. lib. xxix. § 59. p. 488. and the authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 425. inform us, that MICHAEL BALBUS sent these works already translated into Latin to the emperor LEWIS. It is amazing how men of learning could fall into this latter error after reading the following passage in the *Epistle* above quoted: *Authenticos namque eosdem (Dionysii) libros Græca lingua conscriptos, cum echonomus ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ et cæteri missi Michaelis legatione — functi sunt — pro munere magno suscepimus.*

[x] LAUNOY *Diss. de Discrimine Dionysii Areopag. et. Parisiensis*, cap. iv. p. 38. tom. ii. p. I. Opp. as also the other writings of this great man concerning the *Two Dionysius's*.

CENT. IX. and obscure style, a new and more elegant one was given by the famous *JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA*, at the request of *CHARLES the BALD*, the publication of which increased considerably the partisans of the mystic theology among the French, Italians, and Germans. *SCOTUS* himself was so enchanted with this new doctrine, that he incorporated it into his philosophical system, and upon all occasions either accommodated his philosophy to it, or explained it according to the principles of his philosophy.

The state of
polemic or
controversial
theology.

XIII. The defence of Christianity against the Jews and Pagans was greatly neglected in this century, in which the intestine disputes and dissensions that divided the church gave sufficient employment to such as had an inclination to controversy, or a talent for managing it with dexterity and knowledge. *AGOBARD*, however, as also *AMULO* and *RABANUS MAURUS*, chastised the insolence and malignity of the Jews, and exposed their various absurdities, and errors, while the emperor *LEO*, *THEODORUS ABUCARA*, and other writers, whose performances are lost, employed their polemic labours against the progress of the Saracens, and refuted their impious and extravagant system. But it may be observed in general of those, who wrote against the Saracens, that they reported many things, both concerning *MAHOMET* and his religion, which were far from being true; and if, as there is too much reason to imagine, they did this designedly and knowing the falshood, or at least the uncertainty of what they alledged against these infidels, we must look upon their writings rather as intended to deter the Christians from apostasy, than to give a rational refutation of the Saracen doctrine.

The contro-
versy con-
cerning ima-
ges among
the Greeks.

XIV. The contests of the Christians among themselves were carried on with greater eagerness and animosity than the disputes in which they were engaged with the common enemies of their faith; and these contests were daily productive of new calamities and disorders which dishonoured their profession, and cast a heavy, though undeserved, reproach upon the cause of true religion. After the banishment of *IRENE*, the con-

troverſy,

troverſy concerning images broke out anew among the CENT. IX.
 Greeks, and was carried on by the contending parties, during the half of this century, with various and uncertain ſucceſs. The emperor NICEPHORUS, though he did not abrogate the decrees of the council of *Nice*, nor order the images to be taken out of the churches, yet deprived the patrons of image-worſhip of all power to moleſt or injure their adverſaries, and ſeems upon the whole to have been an enemy to that idolatrous ſervice. But his ſucceſſor MICHAEL CUROPALATES, ſurnamed RHANGABE, acted in a very different manner. Feeble and timorous, and dreading the rage of the prieſts and monks that maintained the cauſe of images, he favoured that cauſe during his ſhort reign, and perſecuted its adverſaries with the greateſt bitterneſs and cruelty. The ſcene changed again, upon the acceſſion of LEO the Armenian to the empire, who aboliſhed the decrees of the Nicene council relating to the uſe and worſhip of images, in a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, A. D. 814 [y]; without however enacting any penal laws againſt their idolatrous worſhippers. This moderation, far from ſatiſfying the patriarch NICEPHORUS, and the other partiſans of image-worſhip, only ſerved to encourage their obſtinacy, and to increaſe their insolence; upon which, the emperor removed the haughty prelate from his office, and chaſtiſed the fury of ſeveral of his adherents with a deſerved puniſhment. His ſucceſſor MICHAEL, ſurnamed BALBUS, or the *Stammerer*, was obliged to obſerve the ſame conduct, and to depart from the clemency and indulgence, which, in the beginning of his reign, he had diſcovered towards the worſhippers of images, whoſe idolatry, however, he was far from approving; the monks more eſpecially provoked his indignation by their fanatical rage, and forced him to treat them with particular ſeverity. But the zeal of his ſon and ſucceſſor THEOPHILUS, in diſcouraging this new idolatry, was ſtill more vehement; for he

[y] FLEURY and ſome other writers place the meeting of this council in the year 815.]

CENT. IX. opposed the worshippers of images with great violence, and went so far as to put to death some of the more obstinate ringleaders of that impetuous faction.

XV. Upon the death of THEOPHILUS, which happened in the year 842, the regency was entrusted with the empress THEODORA during her son's minority. This superstitious princess, fatigued with the importunate solicitations of the monks, deluded by their forged miracles, and not a little influenced also by their insolent threats, assembled in the year abovementioned, a council at *Constantinople*, in which the decrees of the second Nicene council were reinstated in their lost authority, and the Greeks were indulged in their corrupt propensity to image-worship by a law which encouraged that wretched idolatry [z]. So that after a controversy, which had been carried on during the space of an hundred and ten years, the cause of idolatry triumphed over the dictates of reason and christianity; the whole east, the Armenians excepted, bowed down before the victorious images; nor did any of the succeeding emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of this superstitious frenzy, or restrain them in the performance of this childish worship. The council that was held at *Constantinople* under PHOTIUS, in the year 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks the *Eighth general council*, gave a farther degree of force and vigour to idolatry, by maintaining the sanctity of images, and approving, confirming, and renewing the Nicene decrees. The superstitious Greeks, who were blind-led by the monks in the most ignominious manner, esteemed this council as a most signal blessing derived to them from the immediate interposition of heaven, and accordingly instituted in commemoration thereof an anniversary festival, which was called the *Feast of Orthodoxy* [a].

[z] See FRED. SPANHEIM *Historia Imaginum*, sect. viii. p. 845. tom. ii. Opp.—LENFANT *Préservatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de Rome*, tom. iii. lettre xiv. p. 147. lett. xviii, xix. p. 509.

[a] See GRETSER. *Observat. in Codicum de officiis Aulæ et Eccles. Constantinopolitanæ*, lib. iii. c. viii. as also the *Ceremoniale Byzantium*, lately published by REISK, lib. i. c. xxviii. p. 92.

XVI. The

XVI. The triumph of images, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs in their favour, was obtained with much more difficulty among the Latins, than it had been among the Greeks; for the former maintained as yet that invaluable, and indeed inalienable, privilege of judging for themselves in religious matters, and were far from being disposed to submit their reason implicitly to the decisions of the pontiff, or to look upon any thing as infallible and true, which had authority for its only foundation. The most of the European Christians, as we have seen already, steered a middle course between the idolaters and the Iconoclasts, between those who were zealous for the worship of images, on the one hand, and those who were averse to all use of them on the other. They were of opinion, that images might be suffered as the means of aiding the memory of the faithful, and of calling to their remembrance the pious exploits and the virtuous actions of the persons they represented; but they detested all thoughts of paying them the least marks of religious homage or adoration. MICHAEL BALBUS, when he sent, in the year 824, a solemn embassy to LEWIS the MEEK, to renew and confirm the treaties of friendship and peace that had been concluded between his predecessors in the empire and CHARLEMAGNE, charged his ministers, in a particular manner, to bring over the king of the Franks [b] to the party of the Iconoclasts, that they might gradually suppress, by their united influence, the worship of images, and thus restore concord and tranquillity to the church. LEWIS, upon this occasion, assembled a council at *Paris* A. D. 824 [c], in order to examine the proposal of the Grecian

Among the
Latins.

[(b) So MICHAEL and his son THEOPHILUS style LEWIS in their letter to him, refusing him the title of emperor, to which, however, he had an undoubted right in consequence of the treaties which they now desired to renew.]

[(c) FLEURY, LE SUEUR, and other historians, place unanimously this council in the year 825. It may be proper to observe here, that the proceedings of this council evidently shew that the decisions of the Roman pontiff were by no means looked upon at this time either

CENT. IX. cian emperor, in which it was resolved to adhere to the decrees of the council of *Frankfort*, which allowed the *use* of images in the churches, but severely prohibited the treating them with the smallest marks of religious *worship*. But in process of time the European Christians departed gradually from the observance of this injunction, and fell imperceptibly into a blind submission to the decisions of the Roman pontiff, whose influence and authority grew more formidable from day to day. So that towards the conclusion of this century the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain kind of religious homage to the saintly images, in which their example was followed by the Germans and other nations [d].

Several Iconoclasts among the Latins,

XVII. Notwithstanding this apostasy the Iconoclasts were not destitute of adherents among the Latins. The most eminent of these was *CLAUDIUS*, bishop of *Turin*, by birth a Spaniard, and also a disciple of *FELIX*, bishop of *Urgel*. This zealous prelate as soon as he had obtained the episcopal dignity through the favour of *LEWIS* the *MEEK*, began to exercise the duties of his function in the year 823, by ordering all images, and even the cross, to be cast out of the churches, and committed to the flames. The year following he composed a treatise, in which he not only defended these vehement proceedings, and declared against the *use*, as well as the *worship*, of images, but also broached several other opinions that were quite contrary to the notions of the multitude, and to the prejudices of the times. He denied, among other things, in opposition to the Greeks,

as obligatory, or infallible. For when the letter of pope *ADRIAN*, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almost unanimously rejected as containing absurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the second council of *Nice*, relating to image-worship, were also censured by the Gallican bishops, and the authority of that council, though received by several popes as an *oecumenical* one, absolutely rejected. And what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican bishops heretics, nor exclude them from the communion of the apostolic see. See *FLEURY*, liv. xlvii.]

[d] *MABILLON*, *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 488.—*Id. Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Act. SS. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. iv. part. I. p. 7, 8.*—*LE COINTE Annal. Eccles. Francor.* tom. iv. ad h. a. 824.

that

that the cross was to be honoured with any kind of worship; he treated relics with the utmost contempt, as absolutely destitute of the virtues that were attributed to them, and censured with much freedom and severity those pilgrimages to the holy land, and those voyages to the tombs of the saints, which, in this century, were looked upon as extremely salutary, and particularly meritorious. This noble stand, in the defence of true religion, drew upon CLAUDIUS a multitude of adversaries; the sons of superstition rushed upon him from all quarters; THEODEMIR DUNGALLUS, JONAS of Orleans, and WALAFRIDUS STRABO [e] united to overwhelm him with their voluminous answers. But the learned and venerable prelate maintained his ground [f], and supported his cause with such dexterity and force, that it remained triumphant and gained new credit. And hence it happened that the city of *Turin* and the adjacent country were, for a long time after the death of CLAUDIUS, much less infected with superstition, than the other parts of Europe.

XVIII. The controversy that had been carried on in the preceding century concerning the *procession* (if we may be allowed that term) of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and also concerning the word *filioque*, foisted by the Latins into the Creed of *Constantinople*, broke out now with redoubled vehemence, and from a private dispute became a flaming contest between the Greek and Latin churches. The monks of *Jerusalem* distinguished themselves in this controversy, and complained particularly of the interpolation of the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the son*, in the abovementioned symbol; nor did they stop here, but dispatched

Continuation
of the contro-
versy con-
cerning the
derivation or
procession of
the holy
ghost.

[(e) In order to do justice to the adversaries of CLAUDIUS here mentioned, it is necessary to observe that they only maintained the innocence and usefulness of images, without pretending to represent them as objects of religious worship.]

[f] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 483.—*Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Ador. SS. Ord. Benedict.* p. viii.—*Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 491. & tom. v. p. 27. 64.—JAC. BASNAGE, *Histoire des Eglises Reformees*, tom. i. period. iv. p. 38. ed. in 4to.

to

CENT. IX. to CHARLEMAGNE, in the year 809, a certain ecclesiastic of their order, whose name was JOHN, to obtain satisfaction in this matter [g]. The affair was debated in due form, both in a council assembled this same year at *Aix-la-Chapelle*, and at *Rome*, in presence of the sovereign pontiff LEO III, to whom the emperor had sent ambassadors for that purpose. LEO adopted the doctrine which represented the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son, but he condemned the addition that had been made to the symbol [b], and declared it as his opinion, that the word *filioque*, or *from the son*, as it was a glaring interpolation, ought to be omitted in reading the symbol, and at length struck out of it entirely, not every where at once, but in such a prudent manner as to prevent disturbance. His successors were of the same opinion: the word, however, being once admitted not only kept its place in opposition to the Roman pontiffs, but was by degrees added to the symbol in all the Latin churches [i].

The controversy concerning the eucharist set on foot by Pascasius Radbert.

XIX. To these disputes of ancient origin were added controversies entirely new, and particularly that famous one *Concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist*. It had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the church, that the body and blood of CHRIST *were* administered to those who received the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and that they were consequently *present* at that holy institution; but the sentiments of Christians concerning the *nature* and *manner* of this *presence* were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with precision that important point, or prescribed the manner in which this pretended presence was to be understood. Both reason and folly were hitherto left free in this matter,

[g] See STEPH. BALUZII *Miscellanea*, tom. vii. p. 14.

[(b) This addition of the word *filioque* to the symbol of *Nice* and *Constantinople* was made in the vth and vith centuries by the churches of *Spain*, and their example was followed by most of the Gallican churches, where the symbol was read and sung with this addition.]

[i] See LE COINTE, *Annal. Eccles. Francor.* tom. iv. ad A. 809.—LONGUEVAL, *Histoire l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. v. p. 151.

nor had any imperious mode of faith suspended the ex-
 ercise of the one, or restrained the extravagance of the
 other. But in this century PASCASIUS RADBERT, a
 monk, and afterwards abbot of *Corbey*, pretended to ex-
 plain with precision and to determine with certainty the
 doctrine of the church on this head, for which purpose
 he composed, in the year 831, a treatise *Concerning the
 sacrament of the body and blood of Christ* [k]. A second
 edition of this treatise, revised with care and considera-
 bly augmented, was presented in the year 845 to
 CHARLES the BALD, and gave principally occasion to
 the warm and important controversy that ensued. The
 doctrine of PASCASIUS amounted in general to the two
 following propositions: *First*, that, after the consecra-
 tion of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, no-
 thing remained of those symbols but the *outward figure*,
 under which the body and blood of CHRIST were really
 and locally *present*; and *secondly*, that the body of
 CHRIST thus present in the eucharist was the *same body*,
that was born of the Virgin, that suffered upon the cross,
and was raised from the dead. This new doctrine, and
 more especially the second proposition now mentioned
 excited, as might well be expected, the astonishment
 of many. Accordingly it was opposed by RABANUS
 MAURUS, HERIBALD, and others, though they did not
 all refute it in the same method, nor upon the same prin-
 ciples. CHARLES the BALD, upon this occasion, order-
 ed the famous RATRAMN and JOHANNES SCOTUS to
 draw up a clear and rational explication of that impor-
 tant doctrine which RADBERT seemed to have so egre-
 giously corrupted [l]. These learned divines executed
 with zeal and diligence the order of the emperor. The

[k] See MABILLON, *Annales Benedict.* ii. p. 539. An accurate edi-
 tion of RADBERT's book is published by MARTENE in the ix tome of
 his *Ampliss. Collect. veter. scriptor.* p. 378. The life and actions of this
 wrong-headed divine are treated at large by MABILLON, in his *Acta
 Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. iv. part. II.* p. 126. and, by the jesuits, in
 the *Acta SS. Antwerp. ad d. xxvi Aprilis.*

[l] For an account of RATRAMN, or BERTRAMN, and his famous
 book which has made so much noise in the world, see FARRICIUS *Bib-
 lioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1661.

CENT. IX. treatise of SCOTUS perished in the ruins of time, but that of RATRAMN is still extant [m], and furnished ample matter of dispute both in the last and present century [n].

And carried
on by his ad-
versary Ber-
tramm.

XX. It is remarkable that in this controversy each of the contending parties were almost as much divided among themselves, as they were at variance with their adversaries. RADBERT, who began the dispute, contradicts himself in many places, departs from his own principles, and maintains in one part of his book conclusions that he had disavowed in another. His principal adversary BERTRAMN, or RATRAMN, seems, in some respects, liable to the same charge; he appears to follow in general the doctrine of those, who deny that the body and blood of CHRIST are *really* present in the holy sacrament, and affirm on the contrary that they are only represented by the bread and wine as their signs or symbols. There are, however, several passages in his book which seem inconsistent with this just and rational notion of the eucharist, or which at least are susceptible of different interpretations, and have therefore given rise to various disputes. JOHANNES SCOTUS, whose philosophical genius rendered him more accurate, and shed through his writings that logical precision so much wanted, and so highly desirable in polemical productions, was the only disputant in this contest, who expressed his sentiments with perspicuity, method, and consistency, and declared plainly that the bread and wine were the *signs* and *symbols* of the *absent* body and blood of CHRIST. All the other theologists of his time fluctuate and waver

[(m) A new English translation of the book of BERTRAMN, priest and monk of Corbey, *Concerning the BODY and BLOOD of JESUS CHRIST in the sacrament*, was published in Dublin in the year 1753; to which is prefixed a very learned and judicious Historical Dissertation concerning this famous author and his works, in which both are ably defended against the calumnies and fictions of the Roman catholic writers.]

[n] There is an account, but a partial one, of this controversy in MABILLON's *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part II. Benedict. p. viii.* which the curious reader will therefore do well to compare with BASNAGE's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 909.

in

in their opinions, express themselves with ambiguity, and embrace and reject the same tenets at different times, as if they had no fixed or permanent principles concerning the matter in question. From all this, however, it evidently appears, that there was not as yet in the Latin church any fixed or universally received opinion concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of *Christ* are present in the eucharist. CENT. IX.

XXI. The disputants in this controversy charged each other reciprocally with the most odious doctrines, which each party drew by way of consequences from the tenets they opposed, a method of proceeding as unjust, as it is common in all kinds of debate. Hence arose that imaginary heresy, that, upon the triumphant progress of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the *x*th century, was branded with the title of *Stercoranism*, and of which the true origin was as follows: They, who, embracing the opinion of *PASCASIUS RADBERT*, believed that the bread and wine in the sacrament were substantially changed after the consecration, and preserved only their external figure, drew a most unjust conclusion from the opinion of their adversaries, who maintained on the contrary that the bread and wine preserved their substance, and that *CHRIST*'s body and blood were only figuratively and not really present in the eucharist. They alledged that the doctrine of the latter implied, that the body of *CHRIST* was digested in the stomach, and was thrown out with the other excrements. But this consequence was quickly retorted upon those that imagined it, for they who denied the metamorphosis of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of *CHRIST*, charged the same enormous consequence upon their antagonists who believed this transmutation, and the charge was much more applicable certainly to the latter than to the former. The truth of the matter is, that it was neither truly applicable to the one nor to the other, and their mutual reproaches, most wretchedly founded, shew rather a spirit of invective, than a zeal for the truth. The charge of *Stercoranism* is but a malign *imagination*: it can never, without the most

Produces un-
seemly dis-
putes found-
ed upon the
imputation of
monstrous
consequen-
ces.

CENT. IX. absurd impudence, be brought against those who deny the transmutation of the bread into the body of CHRIST; it may indeed be charged upon such as allow of this transmutation, though it be a consequence that none of them, who were not frenetic, did perhaps ever avow [o].

The controversy concerning predestination and grace, set on foot by Godeschalcus.

XXII. While this controversy was at its greatest height, another of a quite different kind, and of much more importance, arose, whose unhappy consequences, are yet felt in the reformed churches. The subject of this new contest was the doctrine of *predestination* and *divine grace*, and its rise is universally attributed to GODESCHALCUS, an illustrious Saxon, who had entered involuntarily into the monastic order in the convent of *Fulda*, from whence he removed to the monastery of *Orbais*, in the diocese of *Soissons*, where he not only prosecuted his theological studies with great assiduity, but also with an insatiable desire of founding the deepest mysteries, and of being *wise above what is written*. This eminent ecclesiastic, upon his return from *Rome* in the year 847, took up his lodging for some time with Count Eberald, one of the first noblemen at the court of the emperor LOTHAIRE, where he discoursed largely concerning the intricate doctrine of *predestination* in presence of NOTHINGUS, bishop of *Verona*, and maintained that God from all eternity had pre-ordained some to everlasting life, and others to everlasting punishment and misery. RABANUS MAURUS, who was by no means his friend, being informed of his propagating this doctrine, opposed him with all his might. To render his opposition more successful, he began by representing GODESCHALCUS as a corrupter of the true religion, and a forger of monstrous heresies, in some letters addressed to count Eberald, and to the bishop of *Verona*. And when the accused monk came from *Italy* into *Germany* to justify himself against these clamours, and for that purpose appeared at *Mentz*, of which RABANUS his accuser was

[o] For an account of the *Stereorantists*, see MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sec. iv. Benedict.* part. II. p. 21.—J. BASNAGE, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 926. and a Treatise of the learned Dr. PFAFF, published at *Tubingue* in 1750.

archbishop,

archbishop, he was condemned in a council assembled CENT. IX. by the latter in that city A. D. 848, and sent from thence to HINCMAR, archbishop of *Rheims*, in whose diocese he had received the order of priesthood. HINCMAR, who was devoted to the interests of RABAN, assembled a council at *Quiercy* A. D. 849, in which GODESCHALCUS was condemned a second time, and was also treated in a manner equally repugnant to the principles of religion and the dictates of humanity. Because he was firm in maintaining his doctrine, which he affirmed, and indeed with truth, to be the doctrine of St. AUGUSTINE, the imperious HINCMAR degraded him from the priesthood, and was so barbarous as to order him to be whipped with the utmost severity until the force of his pain overpowering his constancy obliged him, according to the commands of his reverend executioners, to burn with his own hands the justification of his opinions which he had presented to the council of *Mentz*. After these barbarous proceedings the unfortunate monk was cast into prison in the monastery of *Hautvilliers*, where he ended his misery and his days in the year 868, or the year following, maintaining with his last breath the doctrine for which he had suffered.

XXIII. While GODESCHALCUS lay in prison, his doctrine gained him followers, his sufferings excited compassion, and both together produced a considerable schism in the Latin church. RATRAMN, monk of *Corbey*, PRUDENTIUS, bishop of *Troyes*, LOUP, or LUPUS, abbot of *Ferrieres*, FLORUS, deacon of *Lyons*, REMI, archbishop of the same city, with his whole church, all these eminent and illustrious ecclesiastics, with many others whom it would be tedious to mention, pleaded with the utmost zeal and vehemence both in their writings and in their discourse, the cause of this unhappy monk, and of his condemned opinions. Some indeed confined themselves principally to the defence of his person and conduct, while others went farther and employed all their zeal, and all their labour, in the vindication of his doctrine. On the opposite side of the question were

The history of this contest.
HINCMAR

CENT. IX. HINCMAR, his unrighteous judge, AMALARIUS, the celebrated JOHANNES SCOTUS, and others, who all maintained that GODESCHALCUS and his opinions had received the treatment they deserved. As the spirit of controversy ran high between these contending parties, and grew more vehement from day to day, CHARLES the BALD summoned a new council, or synod, which met at *Quiercy* A. D. 853, in which, by the credit and influence of HINCMAR, the decrees of the former council were confirmed, and of consequence GODESCHALCUS again condemned. But the decrees of this council were declared null, and decisions of a different kind, by which GODESCHALCUS and his doctrine were vindicated and defended, were substituted in their place in a council assembled at *Valence* in *Dauphiny*, A. D. 855. This council was composed of the clergy of three provinces, *Lyons*, *Vienne*, and *Arles*, with REMI, archbishop of *Lyons*, at their head, and its decrees were confirmed, in the year 859, by the council of *Langres*, in which the same clergy were assembled, and in 860, by the council of *Touss*, in which the bishops of fourteen provinces supported the cause of the persecuted monk, whose death diminished considerably the heat of this intricate controversy [p].

What judgment we are to form of this controversy.

XXIV. If we attend to the merits of this cause, we shall find that the debate subsists still in all its force, and that the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS has in our days both able defenders, and powerful adversaries. He undoubtedly maintained a twofold predestination, one to everlasting life, and the other to eternal death. He held also "that God did not desire or will the salvation

[p] Besides the common writers, who speak of this controversy, the curious reader will do well to consult the more learned and impartial accounts they will find of it in CÆSAR EGASSE DE BOULAY'S *Histor. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 178.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Benedict.* part. II. p. xlvii.—*Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 352.—US-SERII *Historia Godeschalchi, Hanoviae* 1662, in 8vo. et *Dublini* 1661, in 4to.—GERHARD. JOH. VOSSII *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. vii. cap. iv.—Add JO ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. p. 210.

‘ of all mankind, but that of the elect only ; and that CENT. IX.
 “ CHRIST did not suffer death for the whole human
 “ race, but for that part of it only, whom God has
 “ predestinated to eternal salvation.” These decisions,
 which carry a severe and rigorous aspect, are softly
 and favourably interpreted by the followers of GODES-
 CHALCUS. They deny, for example, that their leader
 represents God as *predestinating* to a necessary course of
 iniquity, those whom he has *predestinated* to eternal mi-
 sery, and, according to them, the doctrine of GODES-
 CHALCUS amounts to no more than this : “ That God
 “ has from all eternity doomed to everlasting misery,
 “ such as he *forsook* would go on impenitent in a sinful
 “ course, and has decreed their ruin in consequence of
 “ their sins freely committed and eternally foreseen :
 “ that the salutary effects of the mercy of God and the
 “ sufferings of Christ extend indeed only to the elect,
 “ and are made good to them alone ; though this mercy
 “ and these sufferings, considered in themselves, belong
 “ equally to all mankind.” But this contradictory jar-
 gon did not satisfy the adversaries of the Predestinarian
 monk ; they maintained, on the contrary, that under
 ambiguous terms and perplexed sentences GODESCHAL-
 CUS had concealed the most enormous errors, propagat-
 ing it assiduously as an article of faith, “ That God had
 “ not only by an original decree predestinated one part
 “ of mankind to eternal damnation, but had also push-
 “ ed them on by an irresistible necessity, by a propel-
 “ lent force, to those crimes and transgressions, which
 “ were proper to render that damnation just [q].”

With-

[q] The cause of GODESCHALCUS has been very learnedly defended by
 the celebrated MAGUIN, who published also a valuable edition, which
 is yet extant, of all the treatises that were composed on both sides of
 this intricate controversy. This interesting collection, which was printed
 at Paris in the year 1650, in two volumes 4to. bears the following title :
Veterum auctorum qui Nono Sæculo de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt,
Opera et Fragmenta, cum Historia et gemina Præfatione. Cardinal NORIS
 maintained also the cause of the predestinarian monk with more brevity,
 but less moderation than MAGUIN. This brief vindication may be seen
 in the *Synopsis Historiæ Godeschalcanæ*, which is inserted in the 4th volume
 of the works of that cardinal, p. 677. All the Benedictines, Jansenists,
 and Augustin monks maintain, almost without exception, that GODES-

CENT. IX. Without determining any thing upon such an intricate and incomprehensible subject, with respect to which silence is the truest wisdom, we shall only observe that the private quarrels, and mutual hatred, that prevailed between RABANUS MAURUS and GODESCHALCUS, were the real source of the Predestinarian controversy, and of all the calamities in which it involved that unfortunate monk [r].

Hincmar
and Godes-
chalcus, dis-
pute con-
cerning the
words *Trina*
Deitas.

XXV. Another, though less important controversy arose about this time concerning the concluding words of a very ancient hymn, which runs thus; *te, trina Deitas unaque, poscimus*, which may be thus translated, *O God, who art three, and at the same time but ONE, we beseech thee, &c.* HINCMAR wisely prohibited the singing these words in the churches that were under his jurisdiction from a persuasion that they tended to introduce into the minds of the multitude notions inconsistent with the unity and simplicity of the supreme being, and might lead them to imagine that there were three Gods. But the Benedictine monks refused to obey this mandate, and BERTRAMN, who was one of the most eminent of that order, wrote a large book to prove the expression *trina Deitas*, or *threefold Deity*, orthodox, from the authority of fathers, which was esteemed the only criterion of truth in these miserable times. GODESCHAL-

CHALCUS was most unjustly persecuted and oppressed by RABANUS MAURUS. The jesuits are of a different opinion; they assert in general, and LOUIS CELLOT, one of their order, has in a more particular manner laboured to demonstrate in his *Historia Godeschalci Præd.* published at Paris in 1655, that the monk in question was justly condemned and deservedly punished.

[r] The parents of GODESCHALCUS consecrated him to God, by devoting him from his infancy, as was the custom of the times, to the monastic life in the monastery of *Fulda*. The young monk, however, being arrived at a certain age, seemed much disposed to abandon his retreat, to shake off his religious fetters, and return again into society; but he was prevented from the execution of this purpose by RABANUS MAURUS, who kept him, against his will, in his monastic bonds. Hence a violent contest arose between these two ecclesiastics, in which LEWIS the MEEK was obliged to interpose, and hence the furious disputes concerning predestination and grace. See *Centuriæ Magdeb. Cent. ix. c. 10.*—MABILLON, *Annal. Bened. t. ii. ad A. 829. p. 523.*

CUS,

cus, who now lay in prison, heard of this dispute, entered warmly into it, and in a laboured dissertation supported the cause of his Benedictine brethren, on which account HINCMAR accused him of *tritbeism*, and drew up a treatise to prove the charge, and to refute that impious and enormous heresy. This controversy, however, was but of a short duration, and the exceptionable passage of the hymn in question maintained its credit, notwithstanding all the efforts of HINCMAR, and continued, as before, to be sung in churches [s].

XXVI. A vain curiosity, and not any design of promoting useful knowledge, and true piety, was the main source of the greatest part of the controversies that were carried on in this century. And it was more especially this idle curiosity, carried to an indecent and most extravagant length, that gave rise to the controversy *Concerning the manner in which Christ was born of the Virgin*, which began in *Germany*, and made its way from thence into *France*. Certain Germans maintained, that JESUS proceeded from his mother's womb in a manner quite different from those general and uniform laws of nature that regulate the birth of the human species; which opinion was no sooner known in *France* than it was warmly opposed by the famous RATRAMN, who wrote a book expressly to prove that CHRIST entered into the world in the very same way with other mortals, and that his Virgin-mother bore him, as other women bring forth their offspring. PASCASIUS RADBERT, who was constantly employed either in inventing or patronizing the most extravagant fancies, adopted the opinion of the German doctors, and composed an elaborate treatise to prove that CHRIST was born, without his mother's womb being opened, in the same manner as he came into the chamber where his disciples were assembled after his resurrection, though the door was shut. He also charged those who held the opinion of RATRAMN with denying the virginity of

The manner
of Christ's
birth be-
comes a sub-
ject of de-
bate.

[s] There is an account of this controversy given by the writers of the life, actions, and doctrines of GODESCHALCUS.

CENT. IX. MARY. This fruitless dispute was soon hushed, and gave place to controversies of superior moment [t].

The first
controversy
between the
Greeks and
Latins on the
account of
Photius.

XXVII. Of all the controversies that divided Christians in this century the most interesting, though at the same time the most lamentable, was that which occasioned the fatal schism between the Greek and Latin churches. A vindictive and jealous spirit of animosity and contention had, for a long time, prevailed between the bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, and had sometimes broke out into acts of violence and rage. The ambition and fury of these contending prelates grew still more keen and vehement about the time of *LEO* the Isaurian, when the bishops of *Constantinople*, seconded by the power and authority of the emperors, withdrew from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs many provinces, over which they had hitherto exercised a spiritual dominion [u]. But in this century they arose to an enormous height and broke forth into a most dreadful flame, in the year 858 [w], when the learned *PHOTIUS* was chosen patriarch of *Constantinople*, by the emperor *MICHAEL*, in the place of *IGNATIUS*, whom that prince drove from his see and sent into exile. For this violent proceeding, though it was justified and applauded by a council assembled at *Constantinople* in the year 861, was far from being attended with a general approbation. *IGNATIUS* appealed from this council to the Roman pontiff *NICHOLAS I.*, who espoused his interests, and, in a council assembled at *Rome* A. D. 862, excommunicated *PHOTIUS* as unlawfully elected; and his abettors for having been concerned in such an unrighteous cause. The new patriarch, however, was so far from being terrified or dejected by this excom-

[t] See *LUCAS DACHERIUS*, his *Spicilegium veterum Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 396.—*MABILLON*, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Benedict.* part. H. p. 51.

[u] See *GIANNONE*, *Histoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 535. 646.—*PETR. DE MARCA*, *De concordia sacerdotis et imperii*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 6.—*LE QUIEN*, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 96.

[(w)] In the original three stands 852, but as this is probably an error of the press, the translator has taken the liberty to correct it in the text.]

munication, that he returned the compliment to the Roman pontiff, and, in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, in the year 866, he declared NICHOLAS unworthy both of the place he held in the church, and also of being admitted to the communion of Christians. CENT. IX.

XXVIII. The Roman pontiff alledged a specious pretext for his appearing in this matter with such violence, and exciting such unhappy commotions in the church. This pretext was the innocence of IGNATIUS, whom, upon an accusation of treason, whether true or false, the emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was but a mere pretext; ambition and interest were the true, though secret springs, that directed the motions of NICHOLAS, who would have borne with patience, nay, beheld with indifference the unjust sufferings of IGNATIUS, could he but have recovered from the Greeks the provinces of *Illyricum*, *Macedonia*, *Epirus*, *Achaia*, *Thessaly*, and *Sicily*, which the emperor and PHOTIUS had removed from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs. Before he engaged in the cause of IGNATIUS, he sent a solemn embassy to *Constantinople* to demand the restitution of these provinces; but his demand was rejected with contempt. And hence, under pretence of revenging the injuries committed against IGNATIUS, he indulged without restraint his own private resentment, and thus covered with the mask of justice the fury of disappointed ambition and avarice.

XXIX. While things were in this troubled state, and the flame of controversy was growing more violent from day to day, BASILIUS the Macedonian, who, by the murder of his predecessor, had paved his way to the imperial throne, calmed at once these tumults, and restored peace to the church, by recalling IGNATIUS from exile to the high station from which he had been degraded, and by confining PHOTIUS to a monastery. This imperial act of authority was solemnly approved and confirmed by a council assembled at *Constantinople* in the year 869. in which the legates of the Roman pontiff ADRIAN II, had great influence, and were treated with

A second
contest con-
cerning the
same person.
Photius de-
graded.

CENT. IX. the highest marks of distinction [x]. The Latins acknowledge this assembly as the viiith *oecumenical* council, and in the religious contests between them and the Greeks were concluded, or at least hushed and suspended. But the controversy concerning the authority of the Roman pontiffs, the limits of their ghostly empire, and particularly their jurisdiction in *Bulgaria*, still subsisted, nor could all the efforts of papal ambition engage either IGNA TIUS or the emperor to give up *Bulgaria* or any other province to the see of *Rome*.

XXX. The contest that had arisen between the Greeks and Latins concerning the elevation of PHOTIUS was of such a nature, as to admit of an easy and effectual remedy. But the haughty and ambitious spirit of this learned and ingenious patriarch fed the flame of discord instead of extinguishing it, and unhappily perpetuated the troubles and divisions of the Christian church. In the year 866, he added to the see of *Constantinople* the province of *Bulgaria*, with which the pontiff NICHOLAS had formed the design of augmenting his own spiritual dominions, and was most bitterly provoked at missing his aim. PHOTIUS went yet farther; and entered into measures every way unworthy of his character and station; for he not only sent a circular letter to the Oriental patriarchs to engage them to espouse his private cause, as the public and momentous cause of the church, but drew up a most violent charge of heresy against the Roman bishops, who had been sent among the new converted Bulgarians, and against the church of *Rome* in general. The articles of corrupt doctrine, or heresy, which this imperious and exasperated prelate brought against the Romans, were as follow: *First*, That they fasted on the *Sabbath*, or seventh day of the week, *Secondly*, That in the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese. *Thirdly*, That they prohibited their priests to marry, and separated from their wives such as were married, when they went into or-

[x] The writers, on both sides of this controversy, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iv. c. xxxviii. p. 372. ders [y].

ders [y]. *Fourthly*, That they maintained that the bishops CENT. IX.
alone were authoris'd to anoint with the holy chrism
baptized persons, and that they, of consequence, who had
been anointed by presbyters, were obliged to receive
that unction a second time from the hand of a bishop.
Lastly, That they had adulterated the symbol or creed
of *Constantinople*, by adding to it the words *filioque*, i. e.
and from the son, and were therefore of opinion that the
HOLY SPIRIT did not proceed from the father only, but
also from the son [z], NICOLAS I, finding the Roman
church thus attacked, sent the articles of this accusation
to HINCMAR and the other gallican bishops in the year
867, desiring them to assemble their respective suffragans
in order to examine and answer the reproach of PHOTIUS.
Pursuant to this exhortation of the pontiff; ODO, AE-
NEAS, and Apo bishops of *Beauvais*, *Paris*, and *Vienne*,
as also the celebrated RATRAMN stept forth gallantly
into the field of controversy against the Greeks, an-
swered one by one the accusations of PHOTIUS, and em-
ployed the whole force of their erudition and zeal in
maintaining the cause of the Latin churches [a].

XXXI. Upon the death of IGNATIUS, which happen- Restored to
his see.
ed in the year 878, the emperor took PHOTIUS into
favour, and placed him again at the head of the Greek

[(y) PHOTIUS attributes to this forced and unnatural celibacy of
the clergy that multitude of children whose fathers were unknown. Re-
markable to this purpose is the following passage from a book of ALVA-
RUS DELAGIUS, bishop of *Sylva* in *Portugal*: *De Planctu Ecclesiæ*; *It*
were to be wished, says he, *that the clergy had never vowed chastity, es-*
pecially the clergy of Spain, where the sons of the laity are not much more
numerous than the sons of the clergy.]

[z] See the letter of PHOTIUS in the collection published by bishop
MONTAGUE, N. II. p. 47. Other writers mention ten heads of ac-
cusation brought against PHOTIUS, but such do not distinguish between
the first and second controversy that arose between the Greeks and La-
tins, and they add to the articles, with which this patriarch was charg-
ed, those that were drawn up in the time of MICHAEL CERULARIUS.
Certain it is, that in the epistle of PHOTIUS, which relates only to the
first controversy, and is the only criterion by which we ought to judge
it, there are no more heads of accusation than the five which we have
enumerated in the text.

[a] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part. II. p. 55.*

CENT. IX. church in the patriarchal dignity from whence he had fallen. This restoration of the degraded patriarch was agreed to by the Roman pontiff JOHN VIII, upon condition, however, that PHOTIUS would permit the Bulgarians to come under the jurisdiction of the see of *Rome*. The latter promised to satisfy in this the demands of the pontiff, to which the emperor also seemed to consent [b]; and hence it was that JOHN VIII sent legates to the council which was held at *Constantinople* A. D. 879, by whom he declared his approbation of the acts of that assembly, and acknowledged PHOTIUS as his brother in CHRIST. The promises, however, of the emperor and the patriarch were far from being accomplished; for after this council the former, most probably by the advice, or at least with the consent of the latter, refused to transfer the province of *Bulgaria* to the Roman pontiff, and it must be confessed that this refusal was founded upon most weighty and important reasons. The pontiff, notwithstanding, was highly irritated at this disappointment, and sent MARINUS to *Constantinople* in the character of legate, to declare that he had changed his mind concerning PHOTIUS, and that he entirely approved of the sentence of excommunication that had been formerly given against him. The legate, upon delivering this disagreeable message, was cast into prison by the emperor, but was afterwards set free; and being raised to the pontificate upon the death of JOHN VIII, recalled the remembrance of this injurious treatment, and levelled a new sentence of condemnation against PHOTIUS.

XXXII. This sentence was treated with contempt by the haughty patriarch; but about six years after this period, he experienced anew the fragility of sublunary grandeur and elevation by a fall which concluded his prosperous days. For in the year 886, LEO, surnamed the *Philosopher*, the son and successor of BASILIUS, deposed him from the patriarchal see, and confined him in an Armenian monastery, where he died in the year

[b] MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 103.

891. The death of PHOTIUS, who was the only au-
 thor of the schisms that divided the Greeks and Latins, ———
 might have been an occasion of removing these unhap-
 py contests, and of restoring peace and concord in the
 church, if the Roman pontiffs had not been regardless
 of the demands of equity, as well as of the duty of
 Christian moderation. But these imperious lords of the
 church indulged their vindictive zeal beyond all mea-
 sure, and would be satisfied with nothing less than the
 deposition of all the priests and bishops, who had been
 ordained by PHOTIUS. The Greeks, on the other
 hand, were shocked at the arrogance of these unjust
 pretensions, and would not submit to them on any con-
 ditions. Hence a spirit of resentment and irritation re-
 newed the spirit of dispute, which had been happily de-
 clining; religious, as well as civil, contests were again
 set on foot, new controversies were added to the old,
 until the fatal schism took place, which produced a last-
 ing and total separation between the Greek and Latin
 church.

C H A P. IV.

*Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church
 during this century.*

I. **T**HAT religious rites and ceremonies were mul-
 tiplied from day to day appears evidently from
 the labours of those writers who began in this century
 to explain to the ignorant multitude their origin, their
 nature, and the purposes they served; for the multipli-
 city alone of these religious rites could render the expli-
 cation of them necessary. JOHANNES SCOTUS, ANGE-
 LOME, REMI, or REMIGIUS, bishop of *Auxerre*, and
 WALSFRIIDUS STRABO were the principal authors, who
 distinguished themselves in this species of sacred litera-
 ture, to whom we may add AMALARIUS, many of whose
 explanations were, however, refuted by AGOBARD and
 FLORUS. Their works are generally intitled *De Offi-
 ciis Divinis*, for in the style of this age religious cere-
 monies

Several writ-
 ters explain
 the origin of
 the rites and
 ceremonies
 now used in
 the church.

CENT. IX. monies were called by that name. The labours of these pious and learned men in illustrating the *ritual* were undoubtedly undertaken with good intentions; but their utility may be well called into question; at least, it is not easy to determine, whether they were not as prejudicial to the church in some respect as they might be advantageous to it in others. Their books afforded, indeed, a certain sort of spiritual nourishment to the minds of Christians in their attendance upon public worship; but this nourishment was both coarse and unwholesome. The reasons alledged for the ceremonies in vogue at this time in the church, and the purposes they were supposed to answer, were, for the most part, not only far fetched, childish, and ridiculous, but also bore the strongest marks of forgery and fiction. It is also farther observable, that these illustrations not only encouraged, but augmented prodigiously, and that to the detriment of real piety, the veneration and zeal of the multitude for external rites and ceremonies. For who would dare to refuse their admiration and reverence to institutions which they were taught to consider as full of the most mysterious wisdom, and founded upon the most pious and affecting reasons.

A general
account of
these rites.

II. It would be endless to enter into an exact enumeration of the various rites and ceremonies, which were now introduced, for the first time, and of which some were adopted by the whole body of Christians, and others only by certain churches. We shall therefore dismiss this matter with the general account which follows, and point out in the notes the sources from whence the curious reader may derive a more particular knowledge of the absurdities of this superstitious age. The carcases of the saints transported from foreign countries, or discovered at home by the industry and diligence of pious or designing priests, not only obliged the rulers of the church to augment the number of festivals or holidays already established, but also to diversify the ceremonies in such a manner, that each saint might have his peculiar worship. And as the authority and credit of the clergy depend much upon the high notion which

which was generally entertained of the virtue and merit CENT. IX. of the saints they had canonized, and presented to the multitude as objects of religious veneration, it was necessary to amuse and surprize the people by a variety of pompous and striking ceremonies, by images and such like inventions, in order to keep up and nourish their stupid admiration for the faintly tribe. Hence the splendor and magnificence, that were lavished upon the churches in this century, and the prodigious number of costly pictures and images, with which they were adorned; hence the stately altars, which were enriched with the noblest inventions of painting and sculpture, and illuminated with innumerable tapers at noon day; hence the multitude of processions, the gorgeous and splendid garments of the priests, and the *masses*, that were celebrated in honour of the saints [c]. Among other novelties the feast of *All-Saints* was added, in this century by GREGORY IV, to the Latin calendar [d]; and the festival of St. MICHAEL, which had been long kept with the greatest marks of devotion and respect by the Orientals and Italians, began now to be observed more zealously and universally among the Latin Christians [e].

III. Nor was it only in the solemn acts of religious worship that superstition reigned with an unlimited sway; its influence extended even to the affairs of private life, and was observable in the civil transactions of men, particularly among the Latin Christians, who retained with more obstinacy than the Greeks a multitude of customs, which derived their origin from the sacred rites of paganism. The barbarous nations, which were converted to Christianity, could not support the thoughts of abandoning altogether the laws and manners of their ancestors, however inconsistent they might be with the in-

Superstition
insinuates
itself into
the transac-
tions of civil
life.

[c] See JO. FECHTII *Liber Singularis de Missis in honorem Sanctorum*.

[d] See MABILLON, *De re Diplomatica*, p. 537.

[e] The holidays, or festivals, of the saints were as yet but few in number among the Latins, as appears from a poem of FLORUS, published by MARTENE in the vth volume of his *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* p. 595.

CENT. IX. dispensable demands of the gospel; nay, they persuaded, on the contrary, the Christians among whom they lived, to imitate their extravagant superstition in this respect. And this was the true and original source of those barbarous institutions that prevailed among the Latins, during this and the following century, such as the various methods by which it was usual for persons accused to prove their innocence in doubtful cases, either by the trial of cold water [*f*], by single combat [*g*], by the fire

[(*f*) All these were presumptuous attempts to force the divine providence to declare itself miraculously in favour of the truth. In the trial of *cold water*, the person accused had the right foot and the left hand bound together, and was, in this posture, thrown naked into the water. If he sunk he was acquitted, but if he floated upon the surface, this was considered as an evidence of guilt. The most respectable authors ancient and modern attribute the invention of this superstitious trial to pope EUGENIUS II, and it is somewhat surprizing that Mr. BOWER has taken no notice of it in his history of that pontiff. BALUZIUS has inserted in the 2d volume of his *Capitularia*, the solemn forms of prayer and protestation, that EUGENIUS had caused to be drawn up as an introduction to this superstitious practice, and FLEURY and SPANHEIM look upon that pontiff as its first inventor. On the other hand, father LE BRUN, a priest of the oratory, maintains (in his *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, tom. ii. p. 140, &c. edit. d'Amsterdam) that this custom was much more ancient than EUGENIUS, and his reasons are not unworthy of attention. Be that as it may, this custom was condemned and abrogated at the request, or rather, by the authority of LEWIS the MEEK about the year 829. It was however revived afterwards, and was practised in the x, xi, and xiiith centuries, as we shall see in the progress of this history. For an account of the *cold water*, Dr. MOSHEIM refers us, in a note, to MABILLON's *Analecfa veteris ævi*, tom. i. p. 47. and ROYE's *De missis dominicis*, p. 152.

The trial by *duel*, or single combat was introduced towards the conclusion of the vth century by GONDEBAUD, king of the Burgundians, after that the abuse of oaths had occasioned the most horrible perjuries, and opened a door to all sorts of injustice. The *duel* was then added to the oath by GONDEBAUD; the successful combatant was supposed to be in the right, and this barbarous test of truth and justice was, in spite of humanity and common sense, adopted by the Lombards, French, and Germans, and derived from them to other nations. It was prohibited first in the year 855, in the iiii^d council of *Valence* in *Dauphiny*.

The *fire ordeal* was practised in various ways. The accused either held a burning ball of iron in his hand, or was obliged to walk bare-foot

fire ordeal [*b*], and by the cross [*i*]. It is no longer a CENT. IX.
 question in our days, from whence these methods of
 deciding dubious cases and accusations derived their ori-
 gin; all agree that they were mere delusions, drawn from

foot upon heated plow shares, whose number was increased in proportion to the number or enormity of the crimes imputed to him; and sometimes a glove of red-hot iron was used on this occasion, as we see in the xth book of the history of *Denmark*, by SAXON the *Grammarian*. If in these trials the person impeached remained unhurt, and discovered no signs of pain, he was discharged as innocent; otherwise he was punished as guilty. The first account we have of Christians appealing to this kind of trial as a proof of their innocence, is that of SIMPLICIUS, bishop of *Autun*, who lived in the 1vth century. This prelate, as the story goes, before his promotion to the episcopal order, had married a wife who loved him tenderly, and who, unwilling to quit him after his advancement, continued to sleep in the same chamber with her spouse. The sanctity of SIMPLICIUS suffered at least in the voice of fame, by the constancy of his wife's affection, and it was rumoured about, that the holy man, though a bishop, persisted in opposition to the ecclesiastical canons to taste the sweets of matrimony. Upon which the dame, in presence of a great concourse of people, took up a considerable quantity of burning coals, which she held in her cloaths, and applied to her breast, without the least hurt of her person or damage to her garments, as the legend says, and her example being followed by her husband with like success, the silly multitude admired the miracle, and proclaimed the innocence of the loving pair. BRICIUS, or St. BRICE (whom Mr. COLLIER, in his *Ecclesiastical History of England*, vol. i. p. 231. represents by mistake as the first christian who endeavoured to clear himself in his way) played a trick of much the same nature in the vth century.

The trial by the *cross* was made by obliging the contending parties to stretch out their arms, and he that continued the longest in this posture gained his cause.]

[*g*] JO. LOCCENII *Antiquit. Sueo-Gothicæ*, lib. ii. cap. vii, viii. p. 144. This barbarous method of deciding controversies by *duel* was practised even by the clergy. See JUST. HEN. BÖEMERI *Jus Eccles. Protestantium*, tom. v. p. 88.

[*b*] PETR. LAMBECIUS, *Rerum Hamburg.* lib. ii. p. 39 — USSERII *Sylloge Epistol. Hibernic.* p. 81. — JOHNSON. *Leges Eccles. Britannicæ.* — MICHEL DE LA ROCHE, *Memoires Litter. de la Grande Bretagne*, tom. viii. p. 391.

[*i*] See AGOBARDUS, *Contra Judicium Dei*, tom. i. Opp. et *Contra legem Gundobadi*, cap. ix. p. 114 — HIER. BIGNONIUS, *Ad formulas Marculphi*, cap. xii. — BALUZIUS, *Ad Agobardum*, p. 104.

the

CENT. IX. the barbarous rites of paganism [k], and not only opposite to the precepts of the gospel, but absolutely destructive of the spirit of true religion. The pontiffs, however, and the inferior clergy encouraged these odious superstitions, and went so far as to accompany the practice of them with the celebration of the Lord's supper and other rites, in order to give them a christian aspect, and to recommend them to the veneration and confidence of the multitude.

C H A P. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

The ancient
sects still in
being.

I. **T**HE sects, that had sprung up in the earlier ages of the church, subsisted still, without almost any change in their situations or circumstances that is worthy of mention. Such of them as were considerably numerous fixed their settlements beyond the limits both of the Greek and Latin empires, and thus out of the reach of their enemies. The Nestorians more especially and the Monophysites, secure under the protection of the Arabians, were extremely industrious in maintaining their credit, and also discovered a warm and active zeal in the propagation of Christianity among those who were yet unacquainted with that divine religion. Some learned men are of opinion that it was only in this century that the Abyssinians or Ethiopians embraced the sentiments of the Monophysites in consequence of the exhortations addressed to them by the doctors of that sect who resided in *Egypt*. But this is

[(k) STRABO tells us in the vth book of his *Geography*, that while the sacred rites of the goddess *Feronia* were celebrated in a grove not far from mount *Soracte*, several persons, transported with the imaginary presence of this pretended divinity, fell into fits of enthusiasm, and walked barefooted over heaps of burning coals without receiving the least damage. The same historian adds, that a spectacle so extraordinary drew a prodigious concourse of people to this annual solemnity. PLINY relates something of the same nature concerning the *Hirpii*. See his *Nat. Hist.* book vii. ch. ii.]

undoubtedly

undoubtedly a wrong account of the matter; for it is CENT. IX. certain that the Abyssinians, who were accustomed to receive their spiritual guide from the bishop of *Alexandria*, commenced Monophysites in the viiith century, if not sooner. For in that period the Arabians made themselves masters of *Egypt*, oppressed the Greeks, and granted to the Monophysites such a powerful protection, as enabled them to reduce under their jurisdiction almost all the churches that had been established in *Egypt* [1].

II. The Greeks, during the greatest part of this century, were engaged in a most bitter controversy, or, to speak more properly, in a bloody and barbarous war with the Paulicians, a sect that may be considered as a branch of the Manichæans, and which resided principally in *Armenia*. This pernicious sect is said to have been formed in *Armenia* by two brothers, PAUL and JOHN, sons of CALLINICES, and inhabitants of *Samosata*, from the former of whom it derives its name; though others are of opinion, that the Paulicians were so called from another PAUL, an Armenian by birth, who lived under the reign of JUSTINIAN II [m]. Be that as it may, a certain zealot called CONSTANTINE revived, in the viiith century, under the government of CONSTANS, this drooping faction, which had suffered deeply from the violence of its adversaries, and was ready to expire under the severity of the imperial edicts, and of those penal laws which were executed against its adherents with the utmost rigour. CONSTANS, JUSTINIAN II, and LEO the Isaurian, exerted their zeal against the Paulicians with a peculiar degree of bitterness and fury, and left no method of oppression unemployed, no means of accomplishing their ruin that were not put in execution; but their efforts were ineffectual, nor could all their power, nor all their barbarity exhaust the patience, or conquer the obstinacy of

[1] *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 283, 284.—LE GRAND, *Dissert.* iv.—LOBO, *Voyage Historique de l'Abyssinie*, tom. ii. p. 18.

[m] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 74. in B. WOLFII *Anecdota Græcis*, tom. i.

that

CENT. IX. that inflexible people, who, with a fortitude worthy of a better cause, made light of the calamities to which their erroneous doctrine exposed them. The face of things changed, however, to their advantage towards the commencement of this century, and their affairs carried a more prosperous aspect under the protection of the emperor NICEPHORUS, who favoured them in a particular manner, and restored to them their civil privileges, as well as their religious liberty [n].

Persecuted
anew.

III. Their tranquillity, however, was but of short duration; it was a transient scene that was soon to be succeeded by yet more dreadful sufferings than they had hitherto experienced. The cruel rage of persecution, which had for some years been suspended, broke forth with redoubled violence under the reigns of MICHAEL CUROPALATES, and LEO the Armenian, who caused the strictest search to be made after the Paulicians in all the provinces of the Grecian empire, and inflicted capital punishment upon such of them as refused to return to the bosom of the church. This rigorous decree turned the affliction of the Paulicians, who dwelt in *Armenia*, into vengeance, and drove them into the most desperate measures. They massacred THOMAS, bishop of *New Cæsarea*, and also the magistrates and judges which the emperors had established in *Armenia*; and after avenging themselves thus cruelly, they took refuge in the countries that were governed by the Saracens, and from thence infested the neighbouring states of *Greece* with perpetual incursions [o]. After these reciprocal acts of cruelty and vengeance, the Paulicians, as it would seem, enjoyed an interval of tranquillity, and returned to their habitations in the Grecian provinces.

IV. But the most dreadful scene of persecution and bloodshed that was exhibited against these wretched heretics, arose from the furious and inconsiderate zeal

[n] See GEORG. CEDRENUS, *Compend. Historiar.* tom. ii. p. 480. Edit. Paris. p. 379.

[o] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 125.—PETRI SICULI, *Historia Manichæorum*, p. 71.

of the empress THEODORA. This impetuous woman, who was regent of the empire during the minority of her son, issued out a decree, which placed the Paulicians in the perplexing alternative, either of abandoning their principles, or of perishing by fire and sword. The decree was severe, but the cruelty, with which it was put in execution by those who were sent into *Armenia* for that purpose, was horrible beyond expression; for these ministers of wrath, after confiscating the goods of above an hundred thousand of that miserable people, put their possessors to death in the most barbarous manner, and made them expire slowly in a variety of the most exquisite tortures. Such as escaped destruction fled for protection and refuge to the Saracens, who received them with compassion and humanity, and permitted them to build a city for their residence, which was called *Tibrica*. Upon this, they entered into a league with the Saracens, and, chusing for their chief an officer of the greatest resolution and valour, whose name was CARBEAS, they declared against the Greeks a war which was carried on with the utmost vehemence and fury. This bloody war continued during this whole century; the victory seemed often doubtful, but the slaughter was terrible, and the numbers, that perished on both sides, prodigious. Many of the Grecian provinces felt, in a more particular manner, the dire effects of this cruel contest, and exhibited the most moving scenes of desolation and misery [p]. During these commotions

[p] GEORG. CEDRENIUS, *Compend. Histor.* p. 541. Ed. Paris. p. 425. Ed. Venet. p. 547, et 429, &c.—ZONARAS, *Annal.* lib. xvi. tom. ii. p. 122. Ed. Venet. The principal authors who have given accounts of the Paulicians are PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, and PETRUS SICULUS, whose history of the Manichæans was published in Greek and Latin at *Ingoldstadt*, in 1604, by MATTH. RADERUS. By the account of PETRUS SICULUS that is given by himself, we learn that in the year 870, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, he was sent ambassador to the Paulicians at *Tibrica*, to treat with them concerning the exchange of prisoners, and lived among them during the space of nine months; this is sufficient to give us a high idea of the power and prosperity of the Paulicians at that time. It is from this

CENT. IX. motions, some Paulicians, towards the conclusion of this century, spread abroad among the Bulgarians their pestilential doctrines, which were received with docility, and took root speedily, as might naturally be expected, among a barbarous people that were but lately made converts to the Christian faith [q].

Whether or
not the Pauli-
cians were
Manichæans.

V. The Greeks treated the Paulicians, of whom we have been now speaking, as Manichæans; though, if we may credit the testimony of PHOTIUS, the Paulicians expressed the utmost abhorrence of MANES and his doctrine [r]. Be that as it may, they were not certainly altogether Manichæans, though they embraced some opinions that resembled certain tenets of that abominable sect. They had not, like the Manichæans, an ecclesiastical government administered by bishops, priests, and deacons: they had no sacred order of men distinguished by their manner of life, their habit, or any other circumstance from the rest of the assembly: nor had councils, synods, or such like institutions any place in their religious polity. They had certain doctors whom they called *Sunecdemi*, i. e. companions in the journey of life and also *Notarii*. Among these there reigned a perfect equality, and they had no pe-

eminent writer, that CEDRENUUS seems to have taken what he has advanced in his *Compend. Histor.* p. 431. What we learn concerning the Paulicians from more modern writers, such as BAYLE, in his *Dictionary*, and B. JO. CHRIST. WOLFIUS, in his *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, p. 247. seems to be derived from BOSSUET's *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, tom. ii. p. 129. But this authority is highly exceptionable; for BOSSUET himself did not consult the true sources of knowledge upon this point, and, what is still worse, the spirit of party seems manifestly to have led him into voluntary errors.

[q] It is not improbable that there are yet in *Thrace* and *Bulgaria*, Paulicians, or Paulians as they are called by some. It appears at least certain, that in the last century some of that sect still subsisted, and dwelt at *Nicopolis*, as we learn from the testimony of URB. CERRI, in his *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 72. who tells us, that PETER DEODATI, archbishop of *Sophia*, caused them to abandon their errors, and return to the catholic faith; but whether this latter part of the account be true or false, is more than we shall pretend to determine.

[r] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 17. 56. 65.—PETR. SICULUS, *Hist. Manich.* p. 43.

culiar

cular rights, privileges, nor any external mark of dignity to distinguish them from the people [s]. The only singularity that attended their promotion to the rank of doctors was, that they changed their lay-names for scripture ones, as if there had been something peculiarly venerable in the names of the holy men, whose lives and actions are recorded in the sacred writings. They received all the books of the New Testament, except the Two Epistles of St. PETER, which they rejected for reasons unknown to us; and their copies of the Gospel were exactly the same with those used by all other Christians, without the least interpolation of the sacred text; in which respect also they differed considerably from the Manichæans [t]. They moreover recommended to the people without exception, and that with the most affecting and ardent zeal, the constant and assiduous perusal of the holy scriptures, and expressed the utmost indignation against the Greeks, who allowed to the priests alone an access to these sacred fountains of divine knowledge [u]. In explaining, however, the doctrines of the gospel, they often departed from the literal sense, and the natural signification of the words, and interpreted them in a forced and allegorical manner, when they opposed their favourite opinions and tenets [w]; and such more especially were the delusive and erroneous explications, which they gave of what is said in the gospel concerning the institutions of baptism and the Lord's supper, and the divine authority of the Old Testament, all which they obstinately rejected. Besides the books of the New Testament, they treated with a particular veneration certain epistles of SERGIUS, the most eminent and illustrious doctor of their sect.

VI. None of the Greek writers have given a complete view of the Paulician system, which was undoubtedly composed of a great variety of tenets; they con-

The opinions
of the Pauli-
cians.

[s] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 31, 32.—PETR. SICUL. p. 44.—CEDRE-
US, l. c. p. 431.

[t] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 11.—PETR. SICUL. p. 19.

[u] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 101.—PETR. SICUL. p. 57.

[w] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 12.

CENT. IX. tent themselves with mentioning six monstrous errors, which, in their estimation, rendered the Paulicians unworthy of enjoying either the comforts of this world, or the happiness of the next. The errors are as follows: "1. They deny that this inferior and visible world is the production of the supreme Being, and they distinguish the creator of this world and of human bodies from the most high God, who dwells in the heavens." It was principally on account of this odious doctrine, which was, however, adopted by all the Gnostic sects, that the Paulicians were looked upon as Manichæans by the Greeks. But what their sentiments were concerning the creator of this world, and whether or not they considered him as a Being distinct from the evil principle, are matters that no writer has hitherto explained in a satisfactory manner. We learn only from PHOTIUS, that according to the Paulician doctrine, the *evil principle* was engendred by *darkness* and *fire*: from whence it plainly follows that he was neither self-originated, nor eternal [x]. "2. They treated contemptuously the Virgin MARY;" that is to say, according to the manner of speaking usual among the Greeks, they refused to adore and worship her. For they did not deny that CHRIST was the son of MARY, and was born of her; although they maintained, as appears from the express testimony of their adversaries, that the divine Saviour brought with him from heaven his human na-

[x] PHOTIUS, lib. ii. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 147. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the Oriental philosophers, from whom the Gnostics and Manichæans derived their origin, considered *eternal matter*, as the seat and the source of all evil; but they believed at the same time, like many of the Gnostics, that this *matter*, endued from all eternity with life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, misery, and disorder. This principle, according to them, is the author of all material substances: while God is the creator and father of spirits. These tenets resemble, no doubt, the Manichæan doctrine, yet they differ from it in several points. It appears most probable, that the Paulicians were a branch of some of the ancient Gnostic sects, which were extremely numerous and diversified, and which, though persecuted and oppressed from age to age in the most rigorous manner by many emperors, could never be entirely suppressed, nor totally extirpated.

ture, and that MARY, after the birth of CHRIST, had other children by JOSEPH; they only fell into the sentiments of the Valentinians, and held that CHRIST passed through the womb of the Virgin, as the pure stream of limpid water passes through a conduit, and that MARY did not preserve her virginity to the end of her days; all which assertions the Greeks rejected with the utmost antipathy and abhorrence. “ 3. They refused to celebrate the holy institution of the Lord’s supper;” for as they looked upon many precepts and injunctions of the gospel to be of a merely figurative and parabolical nature, so they understood by the bread and wine, which CHRIST is said to have administered to his disciples at his last supper, the divine discourses and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a spiritual food and nourishment to the soul, and fill it with repose, satisfaction, and delight [y]. “ 4. They loaded the cross of CHRIST with contempt and reproach;” by which we are only to understand, that they refused to follow the absurd and superstitious practice of the Greeks, who paid to the pretended wood of the cross, a certain sort of religious homage. As the Paulicians believed that CHRIST was clothed with an ætherial impassible, and celestial body, they could by no means grant that he was *really* nailed to the cross, or that he expired, in effect, upon that ignominious tree: and hence naturally arose that treatment of the cross of which the Greeks accused them. “ 5. They rejected, after the example of the greatest part of the Gnostics, the books of the Old Testament, and looked upon the writers of that sacred history, as inspired by the creator of this world, and not by the supreme God. “ 6. They excluded presbyters and elders from all part

[y] The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error concerning *baptism*; it is however certain, that the accounts of that sacred institution, which are given in scripture, were allegorically explained by this extravagant sect; and PHOTIUS, in his *First Book against the Manichæans*, p. 29. expressly asserts, that the Paulicians treated baptism as a mere allegorical ceremony, and by the baptismal water understood the *gospel*.

CENT. IX. " in the administration of the church." By this, however, no more can be meant, than that they refused to call their doctors by the name of *Presbyters*, a name which had its origin among the Jews, and was peculiar to that odious people, who persecuted JESUS CHRIST, and attempted, as the Paulicians speak, to put him to death [z].

[z] These six famous errors of the Paulicians I have taken from the Manichæan history of PETRUS SICULUS, with whom PHOTIUS and C. DRENUS agree, although their accounts of these opinions be less perspicuous and distinct. The explanatory remarks that I have added, are the result of my own reflexions upon the Paulician system, and the doctrine of the Greeks.

T H E
T E N T H C E N T U R Y.
P A R T I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH,

C H A P T E R I.

*Concerning the prosperous events which happened to the
church during this century.*

I. **T**HE deplorable state of christianity in this century, arising partly from that astonishing ignorance that gave a loose rein both to superstition and immorality, and partly from an unhappy concurrence of causes of another kind, is unanimously lamented by the various writers, who have transmitted to us the history of those miserable times. Yet amidst all this darkness some gleams of light were perceived from time to time, and several occurrences happened, which deserve a place in the prosperous annals of the church. The Nestorians in *Chaldæa* extended their spiritual conquests beyond mount *Imaus*, and introduced the Christian religion into *Tartary*, properly so called, whose inhabitants had hitherto lived in their natural state of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and savage. The same successful missionaries spread, by degrees, the knowledge of the gospel among that most powerful nation of the Turks, or Tartars, which went by the name of *Karit*, and bordered on *Kathay*, or on the northern part of *China* [a]. The laborious industry of this sect, and their zeal for

CENT. X.

The propagation of the Christian religion,

[a] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Bibliotheca Oriental, Vatic.* tom. iii. part II. p. 482.—HERBELOT, *Bibliothèque Oriental*, p. 256.

CENT. X. the propagation of the Christian faith, deserve, no doubt, the highest encomiums ; it must, however, be acknowledged, that the doctrine and worship, which they introduced among these Barbarians, were far from being, in all respects, conformable to the precepts of the gospel, or to the true spirit and genius of the Christian religion.

Prester John. II. The prince of that country, whom the Nestorians converted to the Christian faith, assumed, if we may give credit to the vulgar tradition, the name of JOHN after his baptism, to which he added the surname of *Presbyter*, from a principle of modesty. Hence it was, as some learned men imagine, that the successors of this monarch retained these names until the time of GENGIS KAN, who flourished in the fourteenth century, and were, each of them called PRESTER JOHN [b]. But all this has a very fabulous air ; at least, it is advanced without any solid proof ; nay, it appears evident, on the contrary, that the famous PRESTER JOHN, who made so much noise in the world, did not begin to reign in that part of *Asia* before the conclusion of the eleventh century. It is, however, certain beyond all contradiction, that the monarchs of the nation called *Karit*, which makes a large part of the empire of the Mogul, and is by some denominated a province of the Turks, and by others a tribe of the Tartars, embraced Christianity in this century ; and that a considerable part of *Tartary*, or *Asiatic Scythia*, lived under the spiritual jurisdiction of bishops, which were sent among them by the Nestorian pontiff [c].

[b] See ASSEMANI *Biblioth Oriental. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 282.

[c] The late learned Mr. B. THEOPHILUS SIGEFRED BAYER, in his *Preface to the Musæum Sinicum*, p. 145. informed us of his design to give the world an accurate account of the Nestorian churches established in *Tartary* and *China*, drawn from some curious ancient records, and monuments that have not been as yet made public. His work was to have been entitled *Historia Ecclesiarum Sinicarum, et Septentrionalis Asiæ* ; but death prevented the execution of this interesting plan, and also of several others, which this great man had formed, and which would have undoubtedly cast a new light upon the history of the Asiatic Christians.

III. If we turn our eyes to the western world, we shall find the gospel making its way with more or less rapidity through the most rude and uncivilized nations. The famous arch-pirate ROLLO, son of a Norwegian count, being banished from his native land [d], had in the preceding century, put himself at the head of a resolute band of Normans, and seized upon one of the maritime provinces of *France*, from whence he infested the whole country round about with perpetual incursions and depredations. In the year 912, this valiant chief embraced, with his whole army, the Christian faith, and that upon the following occasion: CHARLES the Simple, who wanted both resolution and power to drive this warlike and intrepid invader out of his dominions, was obliged to have recourse to the method of negotiation. He accordingly offered to make over to ROLLO a considerable part of his territories, upon condition that the latter would consent to a peace, espouse his daughter GISELA [e], and embrace Christianity. These terms were accepted by ROLLO without the least hesitation; and his army, following the example of their leader, professed a religion of which they were totally ignorant [f]. These Norman pirates, as appears from many authentic records, were absolutely without religion of every kind, and therefore were not restrained, by the power of prejudice, from embracing a religion which presented to them the most advantageous prospects. They knew no distinction between interest and duty, and they estimated truth and virtue only by the profits with which they were attended. It was from this ROLLO, who received at his baptism the name of ROBERT, that the famous line of Norman dukes derived its origin; for the province of *Bretagne*, and a

CENT. X.
Rollo first
duke of Nor-
mandy con-
verted.

[d] HOLBERGI *Historia Danorum Navalis in Scriptis Societat. Scient. Hafniens.* part. III. p. 357.

[(e) Other writers more politely represent the offer of GISELA as one of the methods that CHARLES employed to obtain a peace with ROLLO.]

[f] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 296.—DANIEL, *Histoire de France*, tom. ii. p. 587.

CENT. X.

part of *Neustria*, which CHARLES the Simple conveyed to his son-in-law by a solemn grant, were, from this time, known by the name of *Normandy* [g], which they derived from their new possessors.

The conver-
sion of the
Polish nati-
on.

IV. The Christian religion was introduced into *Poland* by the zealous efforts of female piety. DAMBROWKA, daughter of BOLISLAUS, duke of *Bohemia*, persuaded, by the force of repeated exhortations, her husband MICISLAUS, duke of *Poland*, to abandon paganism, in consequence of which he embraced the gospel, A. D. 965. The account of this agreeable event was no sooner brought to *Rome*, than the pontiff, JOHN XIII, sent into *Poland* ÆGIDIUS, bishop of *Tusculum*, attended with a numerous train of ecclesiastics, in order to second the pious efforts of the duke and dutchess, who desired, with impatience, the conversion of their subjects. But the exhortations and endeavours of these devout missionaries, who were unacquainted with the language of the people they came to instruct, would have been entirely without effect, had they not been accompanied with the edicts, and penal laws, the promises and threats of MICISLAUS, which dejected the courage, and conquered the obstinacy of the reluctant Poles. When therefore the fear of punishment, and the hope of reward had laid the foundations of Christianity in *Poland*, two national archbishops and seven bishops were consecrated to the ministry, whose zeal and labours were followed with such success, that the whole body of the people abandoned, by degrees, their ancient superstitions, and made public profession of the religion of Jesus [b]. It was indeed, no more than an external profession; for that inward change of affections and prin-

[(g) It was *Neustria* properly, and not *Bretagne*, that received the name of *Normandy*, from the Normans who chose ROLLO for their chief.]

[b] DUGLOSSI *Historia Polonica*, lib. ii. p. 91. lib. iii. p. 95. 239. —REGENVOLSCII *Historia Eccles. Slavon.* lib. i. cap. i. p. 8. —HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. I. p. 41. —SOLIGNAC, *Hist. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 71.

ciples,

ciples, which the gospel requires, was far from being an CENT. X. object of attention in this barbarous age.

V. The Christian religion was established in *Russia* The Christian religion established in Moscow. by means every way similar to those that had occasioned its propagation in *Poland*; for we must not lay any stress upon the proselytes that were made to Christianity among the Russians in the preceding century; since these conversions were neither permanent nor solid, and since it appears evidently, that such of that nation, as, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, had embraced the doctrine of the Greek church, relapsed soon after into the superstition of their ancestors. WLODOMIR, duke of *Russia* and *Muscovy*, married, in the year 961, ANNE, sister of BASILIUS, the second Grecian emperor of that name; and this zealous princess, by her repeated entreaties, and her pious importunity, persuaded at length her reluctant spouse to receive the Christian faith, and he was accordingly baptized A. D. 987, assuming upon that occasion the name of BASILIUS. The Russians followed spontaneously the example of their prince; we have, at least, no account of any compulsion or violence being employed in their conversion [i], and this is the true date of the entire establishment of Christianity among that people. WLODOMIR and his dutchess were placed in the highest order of the Russian saints, and are still worshiped at *Kiovia*, where they lie interred, with the greatest devotion. The Latins, however, paid no respect to the memory of WLODOMIR, whom they represent as absolutely unworthy of faintly honours [k].

VI. The Hungarians and Avari had received some faint And in Hungary. notions of Christianity under the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, and in consequence of the measures that had been taken by that zealous prince for the propagation of the gospel. These notions, however, were soon and

[i] See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baron.* tom. iv. ad A. 987. p. 55. et ad A. 1015. p. 110. — CAR. DU FRESNE, *Familie Byzantine*, p. 143. ed *Parif.*

[k] DITMARUS, *Merseb.* lib. vii. *Caronic.* p. 417. tom. i. *Scriptor. Brunsvic. Leibnitii.*

CENT. X. easily extinguished by various circumstances which took their rise from the death of CHARLEMAGNE; and it was not before the century, of which we now write, that the Christian religion obtained a fixed settlement among these warlike nations [l]. Towards the middle of this century BULOSUDES, and GYVLA, or GYLAS, two Turkish chiefs, whose governments lay upon the banks of the *Danube* [m], made public profession of Christianity and were baptized at *Constantinople*. The former apostatized soon after to the religion of his ancestors; while the latter not only persevered stedfastly in his new profession, but also shewed the most zealous concern for the conversion of his subjects, who, in consequence of his express order, were instructed in the doctrines and precepts of the gospel by HIEROTHEUS, a learned prelate, by whom he had been accompanied in his journey to *Constantinople*. SAROLTA, the daughter of GYLAS, was afterwards given in marriage to GEYSA, the chief of the Hungarian nation, whom she persuaded to embrace the divine religion in which she had been educated. The faith, however, of this new converted prince was feeble and unsteady, and he retained a strong propensity to the superstition which he had been engaged to forsake; but his apostasy was prevented by the pious remonstrances of ADALBERT, archbishop of *Prague*, who came into *Hungary* towards the conclusion of this century, and by whom also STEPHEN, the son of GEYSA, was baptized with great pomp and solemnity. It was to this young prince that the gospel was principally indebted for its propagation and establishment among the Hungarians, whose entire conversion was the fruit of his zeal for the cause of CHRIST. For he perfected, what his father and grandfather had only begun; fixed bishops, with large revenues, in various places; erected magnificent temples for divine worship; and, by the influence of instructions, threatnings, rewards, and

[l] PAULI DEBREZENI *Historia Eccles. Reformat. in Ungaria*, part. I. cap. iii. p. 19.

[m] The Hungarians and Transylvanians were, at this time, known to the Grecians by the name of Turks.

punishments, he brought his subjects, almost without CENT. X. exception, to abandon the wretched superstition of their idolatrous ancestors. These vigorous proceedings, by which STEPHEN introduced the religion of JESUS among the Hungarians, procured him the most distinguished honours of sainthood in succeeding ages [n].

VII. The Christian religion was in a very unsettled In Denmark. state among the Danes under the reign of GORMON, and, notwithstanding the protection it received from his queen, who professed it publicly, was obliged to struggle with many difficulties, and to encounter much opposition. The face of things changed, indeed, after the death of GORMON. His son HARALD, surnamed *Blaaland*, being defeated by OTHO the Great, A. D. 949, embraced the gospel, and was baptized together with his consort and his son SUENO, or SWEIN, by ADALDAGUS, archbishop of *Hamburg*, or as others alledged, by POPPON, a pious ecclesiastic, who attended the emperor in this expedition. It is probable that HARALD, educated by his mother TYRA, who was a Christian, was not extremely averse to the religion of JESUS; it appears, however, certain, that his conversion was less the effect

[n] The Greeks, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles, claim each for themselves the peculiar honour of having been the founders of the Christian religion in *Hungary*, and their respective pretensions have introduced not a little obscurity into this matter. The Germans alledge, that the Christian religion was brought into *Hungary* by GISELA, sister to their emperor HENRY II, who, being given in marriage to STEPHEN, the king of that nation, persuaded that prince to embrace the gospel. The Bohemians tell us, on the other hand, that it was by the ministry of ADALBERT, archbishop of *Prague*, that STEPHEN was converted. The Poles affirm, that GEYSA, having married a Christian princess of their nation, *viz.* ADELHEID, sister to MICISLAS, duke of *Poland*, was induced, by her remonstrances and exhortations, to make profession of Christianity. In consequence of a careful examination of all these pretensions, we have followed the sentiments and decisions of the Greek writers, after having diligently compared them with the Hungarian historians; and we are encouraged in this by the authority of the learned GABRIEL DE JUXTA HORNAD, who, in his *Initia Religionis Christianæ inter Hungaros Ecclesiæ orientali adserta*, published at *Franckfort* in 1740, decides this question in favour of the Greeks. All other accounts of the matter are extremely imperfect, and subject to many doubts and difficulties.

of

CENT. X. of his own choice, than of the irresistible commands of his victorious enemy. For OTHO, persuaded that the Danes would never desist from their hostile incursions, and rapines, as long as they persevered in the religion of their ancestors, which was so proper to nourish a ferocity of temper, and to animate to military exploits, made it the principal condition of the treaty of peace, which he concluded with HARALD, that both he and his subjects should receive the Christian faith [o]. Upon the conversion of this prince, ADALDAGUS and POPPON employed their ministerial labours among the Cimbrians and Danes, in order to engage them to imitate such an illustrious example; and their exhortations were crowned with remarkable success, to which the stupendous miracles performed by POPPON are said to have contributed in a particular manner. These miracles, indeed, were of such a kind, as manifestly shews that they derived their origin from human art, and not from a divine interposition [p]. As long as HARALD lived, he used every wise and probable method of confirming his subjects in the religion they had embraced. For this purpose he established bishops in several parts of his dominions, enacted excellent laws, abrogated superstitious customs, and imposed severe restraints upon all vicious and immoral practices. But after all these pious efforts, and salutary measures, which promised such fair prospects to the rising church, his son SUENO, or SWEIN, apostatized from the truth, and, during a certain time, involved the Christians in the deepest calamity and distress, and treated them with the greatest cruelty and injustice. This persecuting tyrant felt, however, in his turn, the heavy strokes of adversity, which produced a salutary change in his conduct, and happily brought him to a better mind; for being driven from his king-

[o] ADAM, *Brem. Histor.* lib. ii. cap. ii, iii. p. 16. cap. xv. p. 20, in LINDENBROGII *Scriptoribus rerum Septentrional.*—ALB. KRANZII *Wandalia*, lib. iv. cap. xx.—LUDWIGII *Reliquiæ Manuscriptor.* tom. ix. p. 10.—PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. i. p. 59.

[p] JO. ADOLPH. CUPRÆI *Annales Episcoporum Sleswic.* cap. xiii. p. 78.—ADAM *Bremens.* lib. ii. cap. xxvi. p. 22. cap. xlv. p. 28.—JO. STEPHEN. *Ad. Saxonem Grammat.* p. 207.—MÖLLERI *Introduct. ad Historiam Chersones. Cimbric.* part. II. cap. iii. § 14.

dom, and obliged to seek his safety in a state of exile CENT. X.
among the Scots, he embraced anew the religion he had
abandoned, and, upon his restoration to his dominions,
exerted the most ardent and exemplary zeal in the cause
of Christianity, which he endeavoured to promote to the
utmost of his power [q].

VIII. It was in this century, that the first dawn of In Norway
the gospel arose upon the Norwegians, as we learn
from the most authentic records. The conversion of
that people was attempted, in the year 933, by their
monarch HAGEN ADELSTEEN, who had been educated
among the English, and who employed certain ecclesiastics
of that nation to instruct his subjects in the doctrines of
Christianity, But his pious efforts were rendered fruit-
less by the brutal obstinacy, with which the Norwegians
persevered in their ancient prejudices, and the assiduity
and zeal with which his successor HARALD GRAUFELDT
pursued the same plan of reformation, were also with-
out effect [r]. The succeeding princes, far from being
discouraged by these obstacles, persisted firmly in their
worthy purpose, and HACO, among others, yielding to
the entreaties of HARALD, king of *Denmark*, to whom
he was indebted for the Norwegian crown, embraced,
himself, the Christian religion, and recommended it,
with the greatest fervour, to his subjects, in an assem-
bly of the people that was held in the year 945 [s].
This recommendation, notwithstanding the solemnity
and zeal with which it was accompanied, made little
impression upon the minds of this fierce and barbarous
people; nor were they entirely gained over by the zea-
lous endeavours of OLAUS to convert them to Christi-
anity, though the pious diligence of that prince, which
procured him the honour of sainthood, was not altogether
without effect [t]. But that which gave the finishing
stroke to the conversion of the Norwegians was their sub-

[q] SAXON *Gramm. Hist. Dan.* lib. x. p. 186.—PONTOPPIDAN,
De gestis et vestigiis Danorum extra Daniam, tom. ii. cap. i. § 1, 2.

[r] ERIC. PONTOPPIDAN, *Annales. Eccles. Danicæ diplomat.* tom.
i. p. 66.

[s] TORM. TORFÆI *Historiâ Norvegica*, tom. ii. p. 183. 214.

[t] TORFÆUS, l. c. p. 457.

CENT. X. jection to SUENON, or SWEIN, king of *Sweden*, who, having defeated their monarch OLAUS TRYG-GUESON, became master of *Norway*, and obliged its inhabitants to abandon the gods of their ancestors, and to embrace universally the religion of JESUS [*u*]. Among the various doctors that were sent to instruct this barbarous people, the most eminent, both in merit and authority, was GUTHEBALD, an English priest [*w*]. From *Norway*, Christianity spread its salutary light through the adjacent countries, and was preached, with success, in the *Orkney* islands, which were, at this time, subject to the Norwegian kings, and also in *Iceland* and *old Groenland*; for it is evident, from many circumstances and records of undoubted authority, that the greatest part of the inhabitants of these countries had received the gospel in this century [*x*].

IX. In

[(*u*) Dr. MOSHEIM attributes here to SWEIN the honour which is due to his predecessor OLAUS TRYG-GUESON; if it can be esteemed an honour to have promoted a rational and divine religion by compulsion and violence, by fire and sword. OLAUS, who had abjured paganism in *England*, during his youth, in consequence of a warm and pathetic discourse which he had heard from a British priest, returned to *Norway* with a firm resolution to propagate Christianity throughout his dominions. For this purpose he travelled from one province to another, attended by a chosen band of soldiers, and sword in hand performed the functions of missionary and apostle. His ministry, thus enforced, was followed with the desired success throughout all the provinces, except that of *Drontheim*, which rose in rebellion against him, attacked Christianity with the same kind of arguments that OLAUS employed in establishing it. This opposition occasioned several bloody battles, which ended, however, in the defeat of the rebels, and of the god *Thor*, their tutelar deity, whose statue OLAUS dragged from its place, and burnt publicly in the sight of his worshippers. This event dejected the courage of the inhabitants of *Drontheim*, who submitted to the religion and laws of their conqueror. And thus before the reign of SUENON, at least before the defeat of OLAUS by that prince, *Norway* was christian. See *The History of Denmark*, lately published in French by Mr. MALLET, Professor in *Belles Lettres* at *Copenhagen*, vol. i. p. 52, 53.]

[*w*] *Chron. Danicum à LUDEWIGIO editum in Reliquiis MStorum*, tom. ix. p. 11. 16, 17.

[*x*] Concerning the conversion of the inhabitants of the *Orkneys*, see TORM. TORFÆI *Historia Rerum Orcadens.* lib. i. p. 22. and for an account of the *Icelanders*, the reader may consult ARNGRIM. JONAS'S *Cynogææ*, lib. i. ARIUS *Multisc. in Schedis Islandiæ*; as also TORFÆUS, his

IX. In *Germany* the pious exploits of OTHO the Great, CENT. X. contributed, in a signal manner, to promote the interest of Christianity, and to fix and establish it upon solid foundations throughout the empire. This truly great prince, whose pious magnanimity cloathed him with a lustre infinitely superior to that which he derived from his imperial dignity, was constantly employed in extirpating the remains of the ancient superstitions, and in supporting and confirming the infant church, which in several provinces had not yet arrived to any considerable degree of consistence and vigour. That there might be rulers and pastors to govern the church, and to contribute both by their doctrine and example to the reformation and improvement of an unpolished and illiterate people, he established bishops in several places, and generously erected and endowed the bishoprics of *Brandenburgh, Havelberg, Meissen, Magdeburg, and Naumburg*; by which excellent establishments the church was furnished with eminent doctors from various parts, whose instructions were the occasion of raising up new labourers in the gospel harvest, and of thus multiplying the ministers of CHRIST from time to time. It was also through the munificence of the same prince, that many convents were erected for those who, in conformity with the false piety of the times, chose to finish the Christian course in the indolent sanctity of a solitary life, and it was by his express order that schools were established in almost every city for the education of the youth. All this may serve to shew us the generosity and zeal of this illustrious emperor, whose merit would have surpassed the highest encomiums, had his prudence and moderation been equal to the fervour of his piety, and the uprightness of his intentions. But the superstition of his empress [y], and the deplorable ignorance of the

The zeal of
Otho the
Great in the
cause of
Christianity.

his *Histor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 378, 379. 417, and GABRIEL LIRON's *Singularités Historiques et Littéraires*, tom. i. p. 138.—The same TORFÆUS gives a full account of the introduction of Christianity into *Groenland*, in his *Histor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 374. and also in his *Groenlandia Antiqua*, c. xvii. p. 127.

[y] See the life of this empress, whose name was ADELAID, in the *Lectiões Antiquæ* of HENRY CANISIUS, tom. iii. part. I. p. 69.

CENT. X. times, deluded this good prince into the notion, that he obliged the Deity in proportion, as he loaded the clergy with riches and honours, and that nothing was more proper to draw down upon him the divine protection, than the exercise of a boundless liberality to his ministers. In consequence of this idle and extravagant fancy, OTHO opened the sources of his opulence, which flowed into the church like an over-grown torrent, so that the bishops, monks, and religious houses wallowed in wealth and abundance. But succeeding ages perceived the unhappy effects of this excessive and ill-judged munificence; when the sacred orders employed this opulence, which they had acquired without either merit or labour, in gratifying their passions, in waging war against all who opposed their ambitions pretensions, and in purchasing the various pleasures of a luxurious and effeminate life.

The plan of
a holy war
formed in
this century.

X. It was no doubtful mark of the progress and strength of the Christian cause, that the European kings and princes began so early as this century to form the project of a holy war against the Mahometans, who were masters of *Palestine*. They considered it as an intolerable reproach upon Christians, that the very land in which the divine author of their religion had received his birth, exercised his ministry, and made expiation for the sins of mortals, should be abandoned to the enemies of the Christian name. They also looked upon it as highly just, and suitable to the majesty of the Christian religion, to avenge the calamities and injuries, the persecution and reproach, which its professors had suffered under the Mahometan yoke. The bloody signal was accordingly given towards the conclusion of this century, by the Roman pontiff SILVESTER II, and that in the first year of his pontificate. And this signal was an epistle wrote in the name of the *church of Jerusalem*, to the *church universal throughout the world* [z], in which

[z] This is the xxviiith Epistle in the first part of the collection of the letters of SILVESTER II, that is published by DU CHESNE, in the 111d. volume of his *Scriptor. Hister. Franc.*

which the European powers are solemnly exhorted and CENT. X. entreated to succour and deliver the Christians in *Palestine*. The exhortations of the pontiff were, however, without effect, except upon the inhabitants of *Pisa*, who are said to have obeyed the papal summons with the utmost alacrity, and to have prepared themselves immediately for a holy campaign [a].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

I. **T**HE Christian religion suffered less in this century from the cruelty of its enemies, than from the defection of its friends. Of all the Pagan monarchs, under whose government the Christians lived, none behaved to them in a hostile manner, nor tormented them with the execution of compulsive edicts or penal laws, except GORMON and SWEIN, kings of *Denmark*. Notwithstanding this, their affairs were far from being either in a fixed or flourishing state; nay, their situation was full of uncertainty and peril, both in the eastern and western provinces. The Saracens in *Asia* and *Africa*, amidst the intestine divisions under which they groaned, and the calamities that over-whelmed them from different quarters, were extremely assiduous in propagating every where the doctrines of MAHOMET, nor were their efforts unsuccessful. Multitudes of Christians fell into their snares; and the Turks, a valiant and fierce nation, who inhabited the northern coast of the *Caspian* sea, received their doctrine. The uniformity of religion did not, however, produce a solid union of interests between the Turks and Saracens; on the contrary, their dissensions and quarrels were never more violent, than from the time that MAHOMET became their common chief in religious matters. The succours of the former were implored by the Persians, whose country was a prey to the ambitious usurpations of the latter,

The progress
of the Turks
and Saracens.

L 2

[a] See MURATORI *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iii. p. 400.

CENT. X. latter, and these succours were granted with the utmost alacrity and readiness. The Turks accordingly fell upon the Saracens in a furious manner, drove them out of the whole extent of the Persian territories, and afterwards, with incredible rapidity and success, invaded, seized, and plundered the other provinces that belonged to that people, whose desolation, in reality, came on like a whirlwind. Thus the powerful empire of the Saracens, which its enemies had for so many years attempted in vain to overturn, fell at last by the hands of its allies and friends. The Turks accomplished, what the Greeks and Romans ineffectually aimed at; they struck suddenly that dreadful blow, which ruined at once the affairs of the Saracens in *Persia*, and then deprived them, by degrees, of their other dominions; and thus the Ottoman empire, which was still an object of terror to the Christians, was established upon the ruins of the Saracen dominion [b].

The western
Barbarians
persecute the
Christians.

II. In the western provinces the Christians had much to suffer from the hatred and cruelty of those who remained under the darkness of paganism. The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in several parts of *France*, the most barbarous hostilities, and involved the Christians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberless calamities. The Sarmatians, Slavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an aversion for the gospel, or were sunk in a stupid ignorance of its intrinsic excellence and its immortal blessings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Christianity out of their own territories by the most barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infested the adjacent countries, where it was professed, with fire and sword, and left, wherever they went, the most dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The Danes, moreover, did not cease to molest the Christians, until they were subdued by OTHO the Great, and thus, from being the enemies, became the friends of the Christian cause.

[b] For a more ample account of these revolutions, see the *Annales Turcici* of LEUNCLAVIUS; as also GEORGII ELMACINI *Historia Saracenica*, p. 190. 203. 210.

cause. The Hungarians, also, contributed their part CENT. X. to the sufferings of the church, by their incursions into several parts of *Germany*, which they turned into scenes of desolation and misery; while the fierce Arabs, by their tyranny in *Spain*, and their depredations in *Italy*, and the neighbouring islands, spread calamity and oppression all around them, of which, no doubt, the Christians established in these parts had the heaviest portion.

III. Whoever considers the endless vexations, persecutions, and calamities, which the Christians suffered from the nations that continued in their ancient superstitions, will easily perceive the reason of that fervent and inextinguishable zeal, which Christian princes discovered for the conversion of these nations, whose impetuous and savage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of self-preservation, and a prudent regard to their own safety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the gospel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adversaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Christianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of these nations, and soften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Christian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw these infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpose, they proposed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, offered them certain districts and territories, auxiliary troops to maintain them against their enemies, upon condition that they would abandon the superstition of their ancestors, which was so proper to nourish their ferocity, and to increase their passion for blood and carnage. These offers were attended with they desired success, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themselves to the instructions and exhortations of the Christian missionaries, but also to oblige their subjects and armies to follow their examples in this respect.

The effects
of these calamities.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

CENT. X. I. **T**HE deplorable ignorance of this barbarous age, in which the drooping arts were totally neglected, and the sciences seemed to be upon the point of expiring for want of encouragement, is unanimously confessed and lamented by all the writers, who have transmitted to us any accounts of this period of time. Nor, indeed, will this fatal revolution, in the republic of letters, appear astonishing to such as consider, on the one hand, the terrible vicissitudes, tumults, and wars that turned all things into confusion both in the eastern and western world, and, on the other, the ignominious stupidity and dissoluteness of those sacred orders who had been appointed as the guardians of truth and learning. LEO, surnamed the *Philosopher*, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks towards the commencement of this century, was himself an eminent lover of learning, and an auspicious and zealous protector of such as distinguished themselves in the culture of the sciences [c]. This noble and generous disposition appeared with still a greater lustre in his son CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, who not only discovered the greatest ardour for the revival of the arts and sciences in Greece [d], but also employed the most effectual measures for the accomplishment of this excellent purpose. It was with this view that he spared no expence in drawing

The state of
letters among
the Greeks.

[c] See JO. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. part II. cap. v. p. 363.

[d] FABRICIUS, *ibid.* cap. v. p. 486.

drawing to his court, and supporting in his dominions, CENT. X.
 a variety of learned men, each of whom excelled in
 some of the different branches of literature, and in cau-
 sing the most diligent search to be made after the wri-
 tings of the ancients. With this view, also, he became
 himself an author [e], and thus animated by his exam-
 ple, as well as by his protection, men of genius and a-
 bilities to enrich the sciences with their learned produc-
 tions. He employed, moreover, a considerable number
 of able pens, in making valuable extracts from the
 commentaries, and other compositions of the ancients;
 which extracts were preserved in certain places for the
 benefit and satisfaction of the curious; and thus, by va-
 rious exertions of liberality and zeal, this learned prince
 restored the arts and sciences to a certain degree of life
 and vigour [f]. But few of the Greeks followed this
 great and illustrious example; nor was there any among
 the succeeding emperors who equalled these two excel-
 lent princes in zeal for the advancement of learning, or
 in lending, by their protection and encouragement, an
 auspicious hand to raise out of obscurity and dejection,
 neglected and depressed genius. But what is still more
 remarkable, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, whom
 we have now been representing as the restorer of letters,
 and whom the Greeks unanimously admire in this cha-
 racter, is supposed by some to have done considerable
 prejudice to the cause of learning by the very means he
 employed to promote its advancement. For by em-
 ploying learned men to extract from the writers of anti-

[(e) We have yet remaining of CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNE-
 TA, son of LEO the Philosopher, the following productions:

The Life of the Emperor Basilus.

A Treatise upon the Art of Governing, in which he investigates the origin
 of several nations, treats of their power, their progress, their revoluti-
 ons, and their decline, and gives a series of their princes and rulers.

*A Discourse concerning the manner of forming a Land Army and a Naval
 Force in Order of Battle.*

Two Books concerning the Eastern and Western Provinces.

Which may be considered as an account of the state of the empire in the
 time of this prince.]

[f] All this appears evident from the accounts left upon record by
 ZONARAS, in his *Annales*, tom. iii. p. 155. edit. Paris.

CENT. X. quity what they thought might contribute to the improvement of the various arts and sciences, he gave too much occasion to neglect the sources, and flattered the indolence of the effeminate Greeks, who confined their studies to these extracts, and neglected, in effect, the perusal of the writers from whom they were drawn. And hence it unfortunately happened, that many of the most celebrated authors of antiquity were lost, at this time, through the sloth and negligence of the Greeks.

Few eminent writers among the Greeks.

II. This method, as the event manifestly shewed, was really detrimental to the progress of true learning and genius. And accordingly we find among the Greek writers of this century but a small number, who acquired a distinguished and shining reputation in the republic letters; so that the fair and engaging prospects, which seemed to arise to the cause of learning from the munificence and zeal of its imperial patrons, vanished in a short time; and though the seeds of science were richly sown, the natural expectations of an abundant harvest were unhappily disappointed. Nor did the cause of philosophy succeed better than that of literature. Philosophers indeed there were; and, among them, some that were not destitute of genius and abilities; but none who rendered their names immortal by productions that were worthy of being transmitted to posterity: A certain number of rhetoricians and grammarians: A few poets who were above contempt; and several historians, who, without deserving the highest encomiums, were not however totally void of merit. Such were the members which composed at this time the republic of letters in *Greece*, whose inhabitants seemed to take pleasure in those kinds of literature alone, in which industry, imagination, and memory are concerned.

The state of learning among the Saracens.

III. *Egypt*, though at this time it groaned under a heavy and exasperating yoke of oppression and bondage, produced certain writers, who in genius and learning were no wise inferior to the most eminent of the Grecian literati. Of the many examples we might mention to prove the truth of this assertion, we shall confine ourselves to that of EUTYCHIVS, bishop of *Alexandria*, who cultivated

cultivated the sciences of physic and theology with the CENT. X. greatest success, and cast a new light upon them both by his excellent writings. The Arabians, during this whole century, preserved that noble passion for the arts and sciences, which had been kindled among them in the preceding age; and hence they abounded with physicians, mathematicians, and philosophers, whose names and characters, together with an account of their respective abilities and talents, are given by LEO AFRICANUS and other literary historians.

IV. The Latins present to us a spectacle of a very different kind. They were almost, without exception, sunk in the most brutish and barbarous ignorance; so that, according to the unanimous accounts of the most credible writers, nothing could be more melancholy and deplorable, than the darkness that reigned in the western world during this century, which, with respect to learning and philosophy at least, may be called the *Iron Age* of the Latins [g]. Some learned men of modern times have, we confess, ventured to call this in question; but their doubts are certainly without foundation, and the matter of fact is too firmly established by unquestionable authorities, to lose any part of its credit in consequence of the objections they alledge against it [h].
It

[g] The testimonies, that prove the ignorance which prevailed in the xth century, are collected by DU BOULAY, in his *Historia Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 288. and also by LUD. ANT. MURATORI, in his *Antiquitat. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. p. 831. et tom. ii. p. 141, &c.

[h] The famous LEIBNITZ, in his *Præfatio ad codicem juris Nat. et Gentium Diplom.* affirms, that there were more knowledge and learning in the xth century, than in the succeeding ages, particularly in the xi and xii centuries. But this is washing the Ethiopian; it is also an extravagant assertion, and favours much of paradox. We shall be better directed in our notions of this matter by MABILLON, in his *Præfatio ad Act. SS. Ordin. Bened. Quint. Sæc.* p. 2. by the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, and by LE BEUF's *Dissertat. de Statu litterarum in Francia, a Carolo M. ad regem Robert.* who all agree in acknowledging the gross ignorance of this century, though they would engage us to believe that its barbarism and darkness were not so hideous as they are commonly represented. There are, indeed, several considerations that render the reasons and testimonies, even of these writers not a little defective; but we nevertheless agree with them so far, as to grant that

CHAP. X. It is true, there were public schools founded in most of the European provinces, some of which were erected in the monasteries, and the rest in those cities where the bishops resided. It is also true, that through this dismal night of ignorance, there shone forth from time to time, and more especially towards the conclusion of this century, some geniuses of a superior order, who eyed with ardour the paths of science, and cast some rays of light upon the darkness of a barbarous age. But they were very few in number, and their extreme rarity is a sufficient proof of the infelicity of the times in which they appeared. In the seminaries of learning, such as they were, the seven liberal sciences were taught in the most unskilful and miserable manner, and that by the monks, who esteemed the arts and sciences no farther than as they were subservient to the interests of religion, or, to speak more properly, to the views of superstition.

Monkish
learning.

V. They, who were the most learned and judicious among the monastic orders, and who were desirous of employing usefully a part of their leisure, applied themselves to the composition of annals and histories, which favoured of the ignorance and barbarism of the times. Such were ABO, LUITPRAND, WITTEKIND, FULCWIN, JOHANNES CAPUANUS, RATHERIUS, FLODOARD, NOTKER, ETHELBERT, and others, who, though very different from each other in their respective degrees of merit, were all in general ignorant of the true nature and rules of historical composition. Several of the poets of this age gave evident marks of true genius, but they were strangers to the poetic art, which was not indeed necessary to satisfy a people, utterly destitute of elegance and taste. The grammarians and rhetoricians of these unhappy times are scarcely worthy of mention; their method of instructing was full of absurdities, and their rules trivial and for the most part injudicious. The same

that all learning and knowledge were not absolutely extinguished in Europe at this time, and that, in the records of this century, we shall find a few chosen spirits, who pierced through the cloud of ignorance that covered the multitude.

same judgment may be formed in general of the geome-
try, arithmetic, astronomy, and music, which were
more or less taught in the public schools, and of which
a more particular account would be uninstrueting and
insipid.

VI. The philosophy of the Latins extended no farther
than the single science of *logic* or *dialectics*, which they
looked upon as the sum and substance of all human wis-
dom. But this logic, which was so highly admired,
was drawn without the least perspicuity or method from
a book of *Categories*, which some have unjustly attributed
to AUGUSTIN, and others to PORPHYRY. It is true, in-
deed, that the *Timæus* of PLATO, the *Topica* of CICERO
and ARISTOTLE, and the book of the latter, *De inter-
pretatione*, with other compositions of the Greeks and
Latins, were in the hands of several of the doctors of
this century, as we learn from credible accounts; but
the same accounts inform us, that the true sense of these
excellent authors was understood by almost none of
those that perused them daily [i]. It will appear, no
doubt, surprising, that in such an ignorant age, such a
subtil question as that concerning *universal ideas* should
ever have been thought of; true however it is, that the
famous controversy, *Whether universal ideas belonged to
the class of objects, or of mere names*; a controversy which
perplexed and bewildered the Latin doctors in succeed-
ing times, and gave rise to the two opposite sects of the
Nominalists and *Realists*, was started for the first time in
this century. Accordingly we find in several passages
of the writers of this period, the seeds and beginnings of
this tedious and intricate dispute [k.]

The state of
philosophy.

VII. The

[i] GUNZO *Epistol. ad Monachos Augienses* in MARTENE *Collect. Ampliss. Monumentor. Veter.* tom. iii. p. 304.

[k] This appears evident from the following remarkable passage. which the reader will find at the 304th page of the work cited in the preceding note, and in which the learned GUNZO expresses himself in the following manner: *Aristoteles, genus, speciem, differentiam, proprium et accidens subsistere denegavit, quæ Platoni subsistentia persuasit. Aristoteli an Platoni magis credendum putatis? Magna est utriusque auctoritas, quatenus vix audeat quis alterum alteri dignitate præferre.* Here

CENT. X.

The restoration of letters in Europe by Sylvester II.

VII. The drooping sciences found an eminent and illustrious patron, towards the conclusion of this century, in the learned GERBERT, a native of *France*, who, upon his elevation to the pontificate, assumed the title of SYLVESTER II. The genius of this famous pontiff was extensive and sublime, embracing all the different branches of literature; but its more peculiar bent was turned towards mathematical studies. Mechanics, geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and every other kind of knowledge that had the least affinity to these important sciences, were cultivated by this restorer of learning with the most ardent zeal, and not without success, as his writings abundantly testify; nor did he stop here; but employed every method that was proper to encourage and animate others to the culture of the liberal arts and sciences. The effects of this noble zeal were visible in *Germany*, *France*, and *Italy*, both in this and in the following century; as by the writings, example, and encouraging exhortations of GERBERT, many were excited to the study of physic, mathematics, and philosophy, and in general to the pursuit of science in all its various branches. If, indeed, we compare this learned pontiff with the mathematicians of modern times, his merit, in that point of view, will almost totally disappear under such a disadvantageous comparison; for his *geometry*, though it be easy and perspicuous, is but elementary and superficial [1]. Yet such as it was, it was marvellous in an age of barbarism and darkness, and surpassed the comprehension of those pigmy philosophers, whose eyes, under the auspicious direction of GERBERT, were but just beginning to open upon the light. Hence it was, that the geometrical figures, described by this mathematical pontiff, were regarded by

we see plainly the seeds of discord sown, and the foundation laid for that knotty dispute which puzzled the metaphysical brains of the Latin doctors in after times. GUNZO was not adventurous enough to attempt a solution of this intricate question, which he leaves undecided; others were less modest, without being more successful.

[1] This geometry was published by B. PEZIVS, in his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 7.

the

the monks as magical operations, and the pontiff himself was treated as a magician and a disciple of satan [m].

VIII. It was not, however, to the fecundity of his genius alone, that GERBERT was indebted for the knowledge with which he now began to enlighten the European provinces; he had derived a part of his erudition, particularly in phyfic, mathematics, and philosophy, from the writings and instructions of the Arabians, who were settled in *Spain*. Thither he had repaired in pursuit of knowledge, and had spent some time in the seminaries of learning at *Cordoua* and *Seville*, with a view to hear the Arabian doctors [n]; and it was, perhaps, by his example, that the Europeans were directed and engaged to have recourse to this source of instruction in after times. For it is undeniably certain, that, from the time of GERBERT, such of the Europeans as were ambitious of making any considerable progress in phyfic, arithmetic, geometry, or philosophy, entertained the most eager and impatient desire of receiving instruction either from the academical lessons, or from the writings of the Arabian philosophers, who had founded schools in several parts of *Spain* and *Italy*. Hence it was, that the most celebrated productions of these doctors were translated into Latin, their tenets and systems adopted with zeal in the European schools, and that numbers went over to *Spain* and *Italy* to receive instruction from the mouths of these famous teachers, which were supposed to utter nothing but the deepest mysteries of wisdom and knowledge. However excessive this veneration for the Arabian doctors may have been, it must be owned, nevertheless, that all the knowledge, whether of phyfic, astronomy, philosophy, or mathematics, which flourished in *Europe* from the xth century, was originally derived from them; and that the Spanish Saracens, in

Who derived his knowledge and erudition from the Arabians.

[m] See *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. vi. p. 558.—DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. i. p. 314. 319.—NAUDE, *Apologie pour les Grands hommes faussement accusés de la Magie*, chap. xix. § 4.

[n] See DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. i. p. 314.

CENT. X: a more particular manner, may be looked upon as the
 ——— fathers of European philosophy.

CHAP. II.

*Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its
 form of government during this century.*

The corrup-
 tion of the
 clergy.

I. **T**O those who consider the primitive dignity and the solemn nature of the ministerial character, the corruptions of the clergy must appear deplorable beyond all expression. These corruptions were mounted to the most enormous height in that dismal period of the church, which we have now before us. Both in the eastern and western provinces, the clergy were, for the most part, composed of a most worthless set of men, shamefully illiterate and stupid, ignorant more especially in religious matters, equally enslaved to sensuality and superstition, and capable of the most abominable and flagitious deeds. This dismal degeneracy of the sacred order was, according to the most credible accounts, principally owing to the pretended chiefs and rulers of the universal church, who indulged themselves in the commission of the most odious crimes, and abandoned themselves to the lawless impulse of the most licentious passions without reluctance or remorse, who confounded, in short, all difference between just and unjust, to satisfy their impious ambition, and whose spiritual empire was such a diversified scene of iniquity and violence, as never was exhibited under any of those temporal tyrants, who have been the scourges of mankind. We may form some notion of the Grecian patriarchs from the single example of THEOPHYLACT, who, according to the testimonies of the most respectable writers, made the most impious traffic of ecclesiastical promotions, and expressed no sort of care about any thing but his dogs and horses [o]. Degenerate,

[(o) This *exemplary* prelate, who sold every ecclesiastical benefice as soon as it became vacant, had in his stable above 2000 hunting horses, which

rate, however, and licentious as these patriarchs might be, they were generally speaking, less profligate and indecent than the Roman pontiffs. CENT. X.

II. The history of the Roman pontiffs, that lived in this century, is a history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible series of the most flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even those of the Romish communion, unanimously confess. The source of these disorders must be sought for principally in the calamities that fell upon the greatest part of *Europe*, and that afflicted *Italy* in a particular manner, after the extinction of the race of CHARLEMAGNE. Upon the death of the pontiff BENEDICT IV, which happened in the year 903, LEO V. was raised to the pontificate, which he enjoyed no longer than forty days, being dethroned by CHRISTOPHER, and cast into prison. CHRISTOPHER, in his turn, was deprived of the pontifical dignity the year following by SERGIUS III, a Roman presbyter, seconded by the protection and influence of ADALBERT, a most powerful Tuscan prince, who had a supreme and unlimited direction in all the affairs that were transacted at *Rome*. ANASTASIUS III and LANDO, who, upon the death of SERGIUS, in the year 911, were raised successively to the papal dignity, enjoyed it but for a short time, and did nothing that could contribute to render their names illustrious. The history of the Roman pontiffs.

III. After the death of LANDO, which happened in the year 914, ALBERIC [p], marquis or count of *Tuscany*, John X. created Roman pontiff. whose

which he fed with pignuts, pistachio's, dates, dried grapes, figs steeped in the most exquisite wines, to all which he added the richest perfumes. One Holy Thursday, as he was celebrating high-mass, his groom brought him the joyful news that one of his favourite mares had foaled; upon which he threw down the Liturgy, left the church, and ran in raptures to the stable, where having expressed his joy at that grand event, he returned to the altar to finish the divine service which he had left interrupted during his absence. See FLEURY, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* livr. lv. p. 97. edit. *Bruxelle*.]

[(p) It was ALBERT or ADALBERT, and not ALBERIC, who was the son-in-law of the elder THEODORA, of whom Dr. MOSHEIM here speaks.

CENT. X. whose opulence was prodigious, and whose authority in *Rome* was despotic and unlimited, obtained the pontificate for **JOHN X**, archbishop of *Ravenna*, in compliance with the sollicitation of **THEODORA**, his mother-in-law, whose lewdness was the principle that interested her in this promotion [q]. This infamous election will not surprize such as know that the laws of *Rome* were at this time absolutely silent: that the dictates of justice and equity were overpowered and suspended; and that all things were carried on in that great city by interest or corruption, by violence or fraud. **JOHN X**, though in other respects a scandalous example of iniquity and lewdness in the papal chair, acquired a certain degree of reputation by his glorious campaign against the Saracens, whom he drove from the settlements they had made upon the banks of the *Garigliano* [r]. He did not, however, enjoy his glory long; the enmity of **MARZIA**, daughter of **THEODORA**, and wife of **ALBERIC**, proved fatal to him. For this bloody-minded woman having espoused **WIDO**, or **GUY**, marquis of *Tuscany*, after the death of her first consort, engaged him to seize the wanton pontiff, who was her mother's lover, and put him to death in the prison where he lay confined. This licentious and unlucky pontiff was succeeded by **LEO VI**, who sat but seven months in the apostolic chair, which was filled after him by **STEPHEN VII**. The death of this latter, which happened in the year 931, presented to the ambition of **MARZIA**, an object worthy of its grasp; and accordingly she rais-

speaks. **ALBERIC** was grandson to this **THEODORA**, by her daughter **MARZIA**, who was married to **ALBERT**. See **SPANHEIM**, *Eccl. Hist. Secl. x.* p. 1432.—**FLEURY**, *Hist. Eccles.* livre liv. p. 571. edit. *Bruxelle*.—This latter historian is of opinion, that it was the younger **THEODORA**, the sister of **MARORIA**, who, from an amorous principle, raised **JOHN X** to the pontificate.

[(q) **THEODORA**, mistress of *Rome*, had **JOHN X** raised to the pontificate, that she might continue that licentious commerce in which she had lived with that carnal ecclesiastic for many years past. See **FLEURY**, and other writers, &c.]

[(r) In the original we have *Montem Garilianum*, which is, undoubtedly, a mistake, as the *Garigliano* is a river in the kingdom of *Naples*, and not a mountain.]

ed to the papal dignity JOHN XI, who was the fruit of CENT. X. her lawless amours with one of the pretended successors of St. PETER, SERGIUS III, whose adulterous commerce with that infamous woman gave an *infallible* guide to the Roman church [s].

IV. JOHN XI, who was placed at the head of the church by the credit and influence of his mother, was John XI and XII. pulled down from this summit of spiritual grandeur A. D. 933, by ALBERIC his half-brother, who had conceived the utmost aversion against him. His mother MAROZIA had, after the death of WIDO, entered anew into the bonds of matrimony with HUGO, king of *Italy*, who, having offended his step-son ALBERIC, felt severely the weight of his resentment, which vented its fury upon the whole family; for ALBERIC drove out of *Rome* not only HUGO, but also MAROZIA and her son the pontiff, and confined them in prison, where the latter ended his days in the year 936. The four pontiffs, who, in their turns, succeeded JOHN XI, and filled the papal chair until the year 956, were LEO VII, STEPHEN VIII, MARINUS II, and AGAPET, whose characters were much better than that of their predecessor, and whose government, at least, was not attended with those tumults and revolutions, that had so often shook the pontifical throne, and banished from *Rome* the inestimable blessings of peace and concord. Upon the death of AGAPET, which happened in the year 956, ALBERIC II, who to the dignity of Roman consul joined a degree of authority and opulence which nothing could resist, raised to the pontificate his son OCTAVIAN, who was yet in

[s] The character and conduct of MAROZIA are acknowledged to have been most infamous by the unanimous testimony both of ancient and modern historians, who affirm, with one voice, that JOHN XI was the fruit of her carnal commerce with SERGIUS III. ECCARD, alone, in his *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. ii. p. 131. has ventured to clear her from this reproach, and to assert that SERGIUS, before his elevation to the pontificate, was her lawful, and first husband. The attempt, however, is highly extravagant, if not impudent, to pretend to acquit without the least testimony or proof of her innocence, a woman who is known to have been entirely destitute of every principle of virtue.

CENT. X. the early bloom of youth, and destitute, besides, of every quality that were requisite in order to discharge the duties of that high and important office. This unworthy pontiff assumed the name of JOHN XII, and thus introduced the custom, that has since been adopted by all his successors in the see of *Rome*, of changing each their usual name for another upon their accession to the pontificate.

The fate of
John XII.

V. The fate of JOHN XII was as unhappy as his promotion had been scandalous. Unable to bear the oppressive yoke of BERENGER II, king of *Italy*, he sent ambassadors, in the year 960, to OTHO the Great, entreating him to march into *Italy* at the head of a powerful army, to deliver the church and the people from the tyranny under which they groaned. To these entreaties the perplexed pontiff added a solemn promise, that, if the German monarch came to his assistance, he would array him with the purple and the other ensigns of sovereignty, and proclaim him emperor of the Romans. OTHO received this embassy with pleasure, marched into *Italy* at the head of a large body of troops, and was accordingly saluted by JOHN with the title of emperor of the Romans. The pontiff, however, soon perceiving that he had acted with too much precipitation, repented of the step he had taken, and, though he had sworn allegiance to the emperor as his lawful sovereign, and that in the most solemn manner, yet he broke his oath, and joined with ADALBERT, the son of BERENGER, against OTHO. This revolt was not left unpunished. The emperor returned to *Rome* in the year 964, called a council, before which he accused and convicted the pontiff of many crimes; and, after having degraded him in the most ignominious manner, from his high office, he appointed LEO VIII to fill his place. Upon OTHO's departure from *Rome*, JOHN returned to that city, and in a council, which he assembled in the year 964, condemned the pontiff whom the emperor had elected, and soon after died in a miserable and violent manner. After his death the Romans chose BENEDICT V, bishop of *Rome*, in opposition to LEO; but the

the emperor annulled this election, restored LEO to the papal chair, and carried BENEDICT to *Hamburgh*, where he died in exile [t].

VI. The pontiffs who governed the see of *Rome* from LEO VIII, who died A. D. 965, to GERBERT or SILVESTER II, who was raised to the pontificate towards the conclusion of this century, were more happy in their administration, as well as more decent in their conduct, than their infamous predecessors; yet none of them so exemplary as to deserve the applause that is due to eminent virtue. JOHN XIII, who was raised to the pontificate in the year 965, by the authority of OTHO the Great, was driven out of *Rome* in the beginning of his administration; but, the year following, upon the emperor's return to *Italy*, he was restored to his high dignity in the calm possession of which he ended his days A. D. 972. His successor BENEDICT VI was not so happy; cast into prison by CRESCENTIUS, son of the famous THEODORA, in consequence of the hatred which the Romans had conceived both against his person and government, he was loaded with all sorts of ignominy, and was strangled in the year 974, in the apartment where he lay confined. Unfortunately for him OTHO the Great, whose power and severity kept the Romans in awe, died in the year 973, and with him expired that order and discipline which he had restored in *Rome*, by salutary laws executed with impartiality and vigour. The face of things was entirely changed by that event; licentious-

John XIII.
Benedict
VII.

[t] In the account I have here given of the pontiffs of this century I have consulted the sources, which are to be found, for the most part, in MURATORI'S *Scriptores Rerum Italicar.* as also BARONIUS, PETER DE MARCA, SIGONIUS *De Regno Italiae*, with the learned annotations of ANT. SAXIUS, MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiae*, PAGI, and other writers, all of whom have had access to the sources, and to several manuscripts, which have not as yet been published. The narrations, I have here given, are most certainly true upon the whole. It must, however, be confessed, that many parts of the papal history lie yet in great obscurity, and stand much in need of farther illustration; nor will I deny that a spirit of partiality has been extremely detrimental to the history of the pontiffs by corrupting it, and rendering it uncertain in a multitude of places.

CENT. X.

ness and disorder, seditions and assassinations, resumed their former sway, and diffused their horrors through that miserable city. After the death of BENEDICT, the papal chair was filled by FRANCO, who assumed the name of BONIFACE VII, but enjoyed his dignity only for a short time; for scarcely a month had passed after his promotion when he was deposed from his office, expelled the city, and succeeded by DONUS II [u], who is known by no other circumstance than his name. Upon his death, which happened in the year 975, BENEDICT VII was created pontiff; and, during the space of nine years, ruled the church without much opposition, and ended his days in peace. This peculiar happiness was, without doubt, principally owing to the opulence and credit of the family to which he belonged; for he was nearly related to the famous ALBERIC, whose power, or rather despotism, had been unlimited in *Rome*.

John XIV.
and XV.

VII. His successor JOHN XIV, who, from the bishopric of *Pavia* was raised to the pontificate, derived no support from his birth, which was obscure, nor did he continue to enjoy the protection of OTHO III, to whom he owed his promotion. Hence the calamities that fell upon him with such fury, and the misery that concluded his transitory grandeur; for BONIFACE VII, who had usurped the papal throne in the year 974, and in a little time after had been banished *Rome*, returned from *Constantinople*, whither he had fled for refuge, and seizing the unhappy pontiff, had him thrown into prison, and afterwards put to death. Thus BONIFACE resumed the government of the church; but his reign was also transitory, for he died about six months after his restoration [w]. He was succeeded by JOHN XV, whom some writers call JOHN XVI, because, as they alledge, there was another JOHN, who ruled the church during the space of four months, and whom they consequently call JOHN XV [x]. Leaving it to the reader's choice to call

that

[(u) Some writers place DONUS II before BENEDICT VI. See the *Tabulæ Synopticæ Hist. Eccles.* of the learned PFAFF.]

[(w) FLEURY says eleven months.]

[(x) Among these writers is the learned PFAFF, in his *Tabulæ Synopticæ*,

that JOHN of whom we speak, the XV, or the XVI, of CENT. X. that name, we shall only observe that he possessed the papal dignity from the year 985 to 996, that his administration was as happy as the troubled state of the Roman affairs would permit, and that the tranquillity he enjoyed was not so much owing to his wisdom and prudence, as to his being a Roman by birth, and to his descent from noble and illustrious ancestors. Certain it is, at least, that his successor GREGORY V, who was a German, and was elected pontiff by the order of OTHO III, A. D. 996, met with a quite different treatment; for CRESCENS, the Roman consul, drove him out of the city, and conferred his dignity upon JOHN XVI, formerly known by the name of PHILAGATHUS. This revolution was not, however, permanent in its effects, for OTHO III, alarmed by these disturbances at *Rome*, marched into *Italy*, A. D. 998, at the head of a powerful army, and casting into prison the new pontiff, whom the soldiers, in the first moments of their fury, had maimed, and abused in a most barbarous manner, he reinstated GREGORY in his former honours, and placed him anew at the head of the church. It was upon the death of this latter pontiff, which happened soon after his restoration, that the same emperor raised to the papal dignity his preceptor and friend the famous and learned GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II, whose promotion was attended with the universal approbation of the Roman people [y].

VIII. Amidst these frequent commotions, and even amidst the repeated enormities and flagitious crimes of

The influence and authority of the pontiffs increases daily.

tice, &c. But the Roman catholic writers, whom Dr. MOSHEIM follows with good reason, don't count among the number of the pontiffs that JOHN who governed the church of *Rome* during the space of four months, after the death of BONIFACE VII, because he was never duly invested, by consecration, with the papal dignity.]

[y] The history of the Roman pontiffs of this period is not only extremely barren of interesting events, but also obscure, and uncertain in many respects. In the accounts I have here given of them, I have followed principally LUD. ANT. MURATORI'S *Annales Italiae*, and the *Conatus Chronologico-Historicus de Romanis Pontificibus*, which the learned PAPE-BROCHIVS has prefixed to his *Acta Sanctorum Mensis Maii*.

CENT. X. those who gave themselves out for CHRIST's vice-gerents upon earth, the power and authority of the Roman pontiffs increased imperceptibly from day to day; such were the effects of that ignorance and superstition that reigned without controul in those miserable times. ORHO the Great had indeed published a solemn edict, prohibiting the election of any pontiff without the previous knowledge and consent of the emperor; which edict, as all writers unanimously agree, remained in force from the time of its publication to the conclusion of this century. It is also to be observed, that the same emperor, as likewise his son and grandson, who succeeded him in the empire, maintained, without interruption, their right of supremacy over the city of *Rome*, its territory, and its pontiff, as may be demonstrably proved from a multitude of examples. It is, moreover, equally certain, that the German, French, and Italian bishops, who were not ignorant of the nature of their privileges, and the extent of their jurisdiction, were, during this whole century, perpetually upon their guard against every attempt, the Roman pontiff might make, to assume to himself *alone* a legislative authority in the church. But, notwithstanding all this, the bishops of *Rome* found means of augmenting their influence, and partly by open violence, partly by secret and fraudulent stratagems, encroached not only upon the privileges of the bishops, but also upon the jurisdiction and rights of kings and emperors [z]. Their ambitious attempts were seconded and justified by the scandalous adulation of certain mercenary prelates, who exalted the dignity and prerogatives of what they called the apostolic see in the most pompous and extravagant terms. Several learned writers have observed, that in this century certain bishops maintained publickly that the Roman pontiffs were not only bishops of *Rome*, but of the whole world, an assertion which hitherto none had ventured to make [a], and that even among the French

[z] Several examples of these usurpations may be found in the *Histoire du droit Eccles. François*, tom. i. p. 217. edit. in 8vo.

[a] *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 98.

clergy, it had been affirmed by some, that *the authority of the bishops, though divine in its origin, was conveyed to them by St. PETER, the prince of the apostles* [b].

CENT. X.

IX. The adventurous ambition of the bishops of *Rome*, who left no means unemployed to extend their jurisdiction, exhibited an example which the inferior prelates followed with the most zealous and indefatigable emulation. Several bishops and abbots had begun even from the time that the descendants of CHARLEMAGNE sat on the imperial throne, to enlarge their prerogatives, and had actually obtained, for their tenants and their possessions, an immunity from the jurisdiction of the counts and other magistrates, as also from taxes and imposts of all kinds. But in this century they carried their pretensions still farther; aimed at the civil jurisdiction over the cities and territories in which they exercised a spiritual dominion, and aspired after nothing less than the honours and authority of dukes, marquises, and counts of the empire. Among the principal circumstances that animated their zeal in the pursuit of these dignities, we may reckon the perpetual and bitter contests concerning jurisdiction and other matters, that reigned between the dukes and counts, who were governors of cities, and the bishops and abbots, who were their ghostly rulers. The latter therefore, seizing the favourable opportunity that was offered them by the superstition of the times, used every method that might be effectual to obtain that high rank, that hitherto stood in the way of their ambition. And the emperors and kings to whom they addressed their presumptuous requests generally granted them, either from a desire of pacifying the contentions and quarrels that arose between civil and military magistrates, or from a devout reverence for the sacred order, or with a view to augment their own authority, and to confirm their dominion by the good services of the bishops, whose influence was very great upon the minds of the people. Such were the different motives that engaged different princes to enlarge the authority and

The bishops and abbots enlarge also their jurisdiction and prerogatives.

[b] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 186.

CENT. X. jurisdiction of the clergy; and hence we see from this century downwards so many bishops and abbots invested with characters, employments, and titles so foreign to their spiritual offices and functions, and cloathed with the honours of dukes, marquises, counts, and viscounts [c].

Simony and concubinage the principal vices of the clergy.

X. Besides the reproach of the grossest ignorance which the Latin clergy in this century so justly deserve [d], they were also chargeable, in a very heinous degree, with two other odious and enormous vices, even *concubinage* and *simony*, which the greatest part of the writers of those unhappy times acknowledge and deplore. As to the first of these vices it was practised too openly to admit of any doubt. The priests, and, what is still more surprizing, even the sanctimonious monks, fell victims to the triumphant charms of the sex, and to the imperious dominion of their carnal lusts, and entering into the bonds of wedlock or concubinage, squandered away in a most luxurious manner, with their wives or mistresses, the revenues of the church [e]. The other vice above-mentioned reigned with an equal de-

[c] The learned LOUIS THOMASSIN, in his *Disciplina Ecclesiæ veteris et novæ*, tom. iii. lib. i. cap. xxviii. p. 89, has collected a multitude of examples to prove that the titles and prerogatives of dukes and counts were conferred upon certain prelates so early as the xth century: nay, some bishops trace even to the VIIIth century the rise and first beginnings of that princely dominion which they now enjoy. But notwithstanding all this, if I be not entirely and grossly mistaken, there cannot be produced any evident and indisputable example of this princely dominion, previous to the xth century.

[d] RATHERIUS, speaking of the clergy of *Verona* in his *Itinerarium*, which is published in the *Spicilegium* of DACHERIUS, tom. i. p. 381. says, that he found many among them who could not even repeat the Apostles Creed. His words are: *Sciscitatus de fide illorum, inveni plurimos neque ipsum sapere Symbolum, qui fuisse creditur Apostolorum.*

[e] That this custom was introduced towards the commencement of this century is manifest, from the testimony of ORDERICUS VITALIS and other writers, and also from a letter of MANTIO, bishop of *Chalons* in *Champagne*, which is published by MABILLON in his *Analecæ veterum*, p. 429. edit. nov. As to the charge brought against the Italian monks of their spending the treasures of the church upon their wives or mistresses, see HUGO, *De Monasterii Farfensis destructione*, which is published in MURATORI'S *Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. vi. p. 278.

gree

gree of impudence and licentiousness. The election of CENT. X.
 bishops and abbots was no longer made according to the laws of the church; but kings and princes, or their ministers and favourites, either conferred these ecclesiastical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or sold them, without shame, to the highest bidder [f]. Hence it happened, that the most stupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the most important stations in the church, and that, upon several occasions, even soldiers, civil magistrates, counts, and such like persons, were, by a strange metamorphosis, converted into bishops, and abbots. GREGORY VII endeavoured, in the following century, to put a stop to these two growing evils.

XI. While the monastic orders, among the Greeks, and Orientals, maintained still an external appearance of religion and decency, the Latin monks, towards the commencement of this century, had so entirely lost sight of all subordination and discipline, that the greatest part of them knew not even by name the rule of St. BENEDICT, which they were obliged to observe. A noble Frank, whose name was Odo, a man as learned and pious as the ignorance and superstition of the times would permit, endeavoured to remedy this disorder, nor were his attempts totally unsuccessful. This zealous ecclesiastic being created, in the year 927, abbot of *Clugni*, in the province of *Burgundy*, upon the death of BERNŌ, not only obliged the monks to live in a rigorous observance of their rules, but also added to their discipline a new set of rites and ceremonies, which, notwithstanding the air of sanctity that attended them, were, in reality, insignificant and trifling, and yet at the same time severe and burthenſome [g]. This new rule

The monastic discipline declines to nothing.

[f] Many infamous and striking examples and proofs of this simoniacal practice may be found in the work intitled *Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 23. 37. 179. Add to this ABBONIS *Apologeticum*, which is published at the end of the *Codex Canon. Pitbœi*, p. 398. as also MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. v.

[g] See MABILLON, *Annal. Benedicini*, tom. iii. p. 386. and *Præf. ad Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedic.* Sæc. v. p. xxvi. See also the *Acta Sanct.*

CENT. X. rule of discipline covered its author with glory, and, in a short time, was adopted in all the European convents; for the greatest part of the ancient monasteries, which had been founded in *France, Germany, Italy, Britain, and Spain*, received the rule of the monks of *Clugni*, to which also the convents, newly established, were subjected by their founders. And thus it was, that the *Order of the Clugni* arrived to that high degree of eminence and authority, opulence and dignity, which it exhibited to the Christian world in the following century [b].

Greek writers.

XII. The more eminent Greek writers of this century are easily numbered; among them was *SIMEON*, high treasurer of *Constantinople*, who, from his giving a new and more elegant stile to the *Lives of the Saints*, which had been originally composed in a gross and barbarous lan-

tor. Bened. Sac. v. p. 66. in which he speaks largely concerning *BERNO*, the first abbot of *Clugni*, who laid the foundation of that order, and of *ODO* (p. 122) who gave it a new degree of perfection. The learned *HELYOT*, in his *Histoire des Ordres Religieuses*, tom. v. p. 184, has given a complete and elegant history of the order of *Clugni*, and the present state of that famous monastery is described by *MARTENE*, in his *Voyage Litter. de deux Benedict.* part. I. p. 227.

[b] If we are not mistaken, the greatest part of ecclesiastical historians have not perceived the true meaning and force of the word *order* in its application to the *Cistercian* monks, those of *Clugni*, and other convents. They imagine that this term signifies a new monastic institution, as if the *Order of Clugni* was a new sect of monks never before heard of. But this is a great error into which they fall by confounding the ancient meaning of that term with the sense in which it was used in modern times. The word *order*, when employed by the writers of the xth century, signified no more at first than a certain form or rule of monastic discipline; but from this primitive signification, another, and a secondary one was gradually derived. So that by the word *order* is also understood, an association or confederacy of several monasteries, subjected to the same rule of discipline under the jurisdiction and inspection of one common chief. Hence we conclude, that the *Order of Clugni* was a new sect of monks, such as were the *Carthusian, Dominican, and Franciscan Orders*; but signified only, *first*, that new institution or rule of discipline, which *Odo* had prescribed to the Benedictine monks, who were settled at *Clugni*, and, *afterwards*, that prodigious multitude of monasteries throughout *Europe*, which received the rule established at *Clugni*, and were formed by association into a sort of community, of which the abbot of *Clugni* was the chief.

guage,

guage, was distinguished by the title of *Metaphrast*, or *CENT. X. Translator* [i]. He did not, however, content himself with digesting, polishing, and embellishing the faintly chronicle, but went so far as to augment it with a multitude of trifling fables drawn from the fecundity of his own imagination.

NICON, an Armenian monk, composed a treatise, *Concerning the Religion of the Armenians*, which is not altogether contemptible.

Some place in this century OLYMPIODORUS [k] and OECUMENIUS, who distinguished themselves by those compilations which are known by the name of *Catenæ*, or *Chains*, and of which we have had occasion to speak more than once in the course of this history. But it is by no means certain, that these two writers belong to the xth century, and they are placed there only by conjecture.

It is much more probable, that the learned SUIDAS, author of the celebrated *Greek Lexicon*, lived in the period now before us.

Among the Arabians no author acquired a higher reputation than EUTYCHIUS, bishop of *Alexandria*, whose *Annals*, with several other productions of his learned pen, are still extant [l].

XIII. The most eminent of the Latin writers of this century was GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II, who has already been mentioned with the applause due to his singular merit. The other writers of this age were far from being eminent in any respect.

Odo, who laid the foundations of the celebrated *Order of Clugni*, left behind him several productions in which the grossest superstition reigns, and in which it

[i] See LEO ALLATIUS, *De Symeonum Scriptis*, p. 24.—JO. BOLANDUS, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Antwerp.* § iii. p. 6.

[k] For an account of OECUMENIUS, see MONTFAUCON *Biblioth. Coisliniana*, p. 274.

[l] See JO. ALBERT. FABRICII *Bibliographia Antiquaria*, p. 179.—As also EUSEBII RENAUDOTI *Historia Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 347.

CENT. X. is difficult to perceive the smallest marks of true genius
 — or solid judgment [m].

The learned reader will form a different opinion of RATHEIR, bishop of *Verona*, whose works, yet extant, give evident proofs of sagacity and judgment, and breathe throughout an ardent love of virtue [n].

ATTO, bishop of *Vercelli*, composed a treatise, *De pressuris Ecclesiasticis*, i. e. *Concerning the Sufferings and Grievances of the Church*, which shews in their true colours the spirit and complexion of the times [o].

DUNSTAN, the famous abbot of *Glastonbury*, and afterwards archbishop of *Canterbury*, composed in favour of the monks a book, *De Concordia Regularum*, i. e. *Concerning the Harmony of the Monastic Rules* [p].

ELFRIC, archbishop of *Canterbury*, acquired a considerable reputation, among the Anglo-Saxons established in *Britain*, by various productions [q].

BURCHARD, bishop of *Worms*, is highly esteemed among the Canonists on account of his celebrated *Decreta*, which he has divided into xx books; though a part of the merit of this collection of *Canons* is due to OLBERT, with whose assistance it was composed [r].

ODILO, archbishop of *Lions* [s], was the author of some insipid discourses, and other productions, whose mediocrity has almost sunk them in a total oblivion.

[m] *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 229.

[n] *Id. Ibid.* p. 339.

[o] *Id. Ibid.* p. 281.

[(p)] See the ample account that is given of this eminent prelate in COLLIER'S *Ecclesiastical History of England*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 181. 183, 184, 185. 197. 203.]

[(q)] We have a *Grammar* and a *Dictionary* composed by this learned prelate; as also an Anglo-Saxon translation of the *First Books of the Holy Scripture*, *A History of the Church*, and 180 *Sermons*. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccle.* livre. lviii. p. 384. edit. de Bruxelles.]

[r] See the *Cbronicon Wormatiense* in LUDWIG'S *Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum*, tom. ii. p. 43.—*Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 295.

[(s)] ODILO was abbot of *Clugni*, and not archbishop of *Lions*, which latter eminent station he obstinately refused, notwithstanding the urgent entreaties employed both by pontiffs and emperors to engage him to accept it. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccl.* livre lix. p. 520. edit. de Bruxelles.]

As to the historical writers and annalists who lived in CENT. X. this century, their works and abilities have been already considered in their proper place.

C H A P. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church in this century.

I. **T**HE state of religion in this century was such as The state of religion. might be expected in times of prevailing ignorance and corruption. The most important doctrines of Christianity were disfigured and perverted in the most wretched manner, and such as had preserved, in unskilful hands, their primitive purity, were nevertheless obscured with a multitude of vain opinions and idle fancies, so that their intrinsic excellence and lustre were little attended to; all this will appear evident to those who look with the smallest degree of attention into the writers of this age. Both Greeks and Latins placed the essence and life of religion in the worship of images, and departed saints, in searching after with zeal, and preserving with a devout care and veneration, the sacred relics of holy men and women, and in accumulating riches upon the priests and monks, whose opulence increased with the progress of superstition. Scarcely did any Christian dare to approach the throne of God, without rendering first the saints and images propitious by a solemn round of expiatory rites and lustrations. The ardour also with which relics were sought surpasses almost all credibility; it had seized all ranks and orders among the people, and was grown into a sort of fanaticism and frenzy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the supreme being interposed, in an especial and extraordinary manner, to discover to doating old-wives and bare-headed friars the places where the bones or carcases of the saints lay dispersed or interred. The fears of purgatory, of that fire that was to destroy the remaining impurities of departed souls, were now carried to the greatest height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped
to

CENT. X.

to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints; while from the pains of purgatory they knew there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to encrease their authority and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them, and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.

The disputes concerning predestination and the Lord's supper.

II. The contests concerning predestination, and grace, as also concerning the eucharist, that had agitated the church in the preceeding century, were in this happily reduced to silence. This was owing to the mutual toleration that was practised by the contending parties, who, as we learn from writers of undoubted credit, left it to each other's free choice to retain, or to change, their former opinions. Besides, the ignorance and stupidity of this degenerate age were ill suited to such deep inquiries as these contests demanded; nor was there almost any curiosity among an illiterate multitude to know the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning these and other knotty points of theology. Thus it happened, that the followers of AUGUSTIN and PELAGIUS flourished equally in this century, and that, if there were many who maintained the corporal presence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the holy sacrament, there were still more, who were either come to no fixed determination upon this point, or declared it publickly as their opinion, that the divine Saviour was really absent from the eucharistical sacrament, and was received only by a certain inward impulse of faith, and that in a manner wholly spiritual [1]. This mutual toleration, as it is easy to

con-

[1] It is certain, that the Latin doctors of this century differed much in their sentiments about the manner in which the body and blood of CHRIST were present in the eucharist; this is granted by such of the Roman catholic writers as have been ingenious enough to sacrifice the spirit of the party to the love of truth. That the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as it is commonly called, was unknown to the English in this

conclude from what has been already observed, must CENT. X.
 not be attributed either to the wisdom or virtue of an
 age, which was almost totally ignorant of both. The
 truth of the matter is that the divines of this century
 wanted both the capacity and the inclination to attack
 or defend any doctrine, whose refutation or defence re-
 quired the smallest portion of learning or logic.

III. That the whole Christian world was covered, at
 this time, with a thick and gloomy veil of superstition,
 evident from a prodigious number of testimonies and
 examples which it is needless to mention. This horri-
 ble cloud, which hid almost every ray of truth from the
 eyes of the multitude, furnished a favourable opportu-
 nity to the priests and monks of propagating many ab-
 surd and ridiculous opinions, which contributed not a
 little to confirm their credit. Among these opinions,
 which dishonoured so frequently the Latin church, and
 produced from time to time such violent agitations, none
 occasioned such a universal panic, nor such dreadful
 impressions of terror or dismay, as a notion that now
 prevailed of the immediate approach of the day of judg-
 ment. This notion, which took its rise from a remarka-
 ble passage in the *Revelations of St. JOHN* [u], and had
 been entertained by some doctors in the preceding cen-

Superstition
 nourished by
 a multitude
 of vain and
 idle opinions.

this century, has been abundantly proved from the public *Homilies* by
 RAPIN DE THOYRAS, in his *History of England*, vol. i. p. 463. It is,
 however, to be confessed, on the other hand, that this absurd doctrine
 was already adopted by several French and German divines. [For a
 judicious account of the opinions of the Saxon English church con-
 cerning the eucharist, see COLLIER'S *Ecclesiastical History of Great-Bri-
 tain*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 204. 266.]

[(u) The passage here referred to is in the xxth chapter of the *Book
 of Revelations*, at the 2, 3, and 4th verses, "And he laid hold of the
 " dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan, and bound
 " him a thousand years; — and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut
 " him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations
 " no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that
 " he must be loosed a little season.—And I saw thrones, and they sat
 " upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls
 " of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word
 " of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image,
 " neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands;
 " and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."]

tury,

CENT. X. tury, was advanced publicly by many at this time, and spreading itself with an amazing rapidity through the European provinces, it threw them into the deepest consternation and anguish. For they imagined that St. JOHN had clearly foretold that after a thousand years from the birth of CHRIST, SATAN was to be let loose from his prison, ANTICHRIST to come and the destruction and conflagration of the world to follow these great and terrible events. Hence prodigious numbers of people, abandoning all their civil connexions and their parental relations, and giving over to the churches or monasteries all their lands, treasures, and worldly effects, repaired, with the utmost precipitation, to *Palestine*, where they imagined that CHRIST would descend from heaven to judge the world. Others devoted themselves by a solemn and voluntary oath to the service of the churches, convents and priesthood, whose slaves they became, in the most rigorous sense of that word, performing daily their heavy tasks; and all this from a notion, that the supreme judge would diminish the severity of their sentence, and look upon them with a more favourable and propitious eye, on account of their having made themselves the slaves of his ministers. When an eclipse of the sun or moon happened to be visible, the cities were deserted, and their miserable inhabitants fled for refuge to hollow caverns, and hid themselves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending summits of steep mountains. The opulent attempted to bribe the deity and the saintly tribe by rich donations conferred upon the sacerdotal and monastic orders, who were looked upon as the immediate vicegerents of heaven. In many places temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were suffered to decay, nay, were deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any use since the final dissolution of all things was at hand. In a word no language is sufficient to express the confusion and despair that tormented the minds of miserable mortals upon this occasion. This general delusion was, indeed, opposed and combated by the discerning few, who

who endeavoured to dispel these groundless terrors, and to efface the notion, from which they arose, in the minds of the people. But their attempts were ineffectual; nor could the dreadful apprehensions of the superstitious multitude be entirely removed before the conclusion of this century. Then, when they saw that the so much dreaded period had passed without the arrival of any great calamity, they began to understand that St. JOHN had not really foretold, what they so much feared [w].

IV. The number of the saints, who were looked upon as ministers of the kingdom of heaven, and whose patronage was esteemed such an unspeakable blessing, was now multiplied every where, and the celestial courts were filled with new legions of this species of beings, some of which, as we have had formerly occasion to observe, had no existence but in the imagination of their deluded clients and worshippers. This multiplication of saints may be easily accounted for, when we consider that superstition, the source of fear, was grown to such an enormous height in this age, as rendered the creation of new patrons necessary to calm the anxiety of trembling mortals. Besides, the corruption and impiety that now reigned with a horrid sway, and the licentiousness and dissolu-

The saints.

[w] Almost all the donations that were made to the church during this century, carry evident marks of this groundless panic that had seized all the European nations, as the reasons of these donations are generally expressed in the following words: *Appropinquante mundi termino, &c.* i. e. *The end of the world being now at hand, &c.* Among the many undeniable testimonies that we have from ancient records of this universal delusion, that was so profitable to the sacerdotal order, we shall confine ourselves to the quotation of one very remarkable passage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, abbot of Fleury, *adversus Arnulphum*; i. e. Arnoul bishop of Orleans, which apology is published by the learned FRANCIS PITHOU in the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Romanæ*, p. 401. The words of ABBO are as follow: *De fine quoque mundi coram populo sermonem in Ecclesia Parisiorum Adolescentulus audiivi, quod statim finito mille annorum numero Antichristus adveniret, et non longo post tempore universale judicium succederet: cui prædicationi ex Evangeliiis, ac Apocalypsi, et libro Danielis quâ potui virtute restiti. Denique et errorem, qui de fine mundi inolevit, Abbas meus beatæ memoriæ Richardus, sagaci animo propulit, postquam litteras à Lothariensibus accepit, quibus me respondere iussit. Nam fama pæne totum mundum impleverat, quod, quando Annuntiatio Dominica in Parasceve contigisset, absque ullo scrupulo finis sæculi esset.*

CENT. X. tion that had so generally infected all ranks and orders of men, rendered the reputation of sanctity very easy to be acquired; for amidst such a perverse generation, it demanded no great efforts of virtue to be esteemed holy, and this, no doubt, contributed to increase considerably the number of the celestial advocates. All those, to whom nature had given an austere complexion, a gloomy temper, or an enthusiastic imagination, were, in consequence, of an advantageous comparison with the profligate multitude revered as the favourites of heaven, and as the friends of God.

The Roman pontiff, who before this period had pretended to the right of creating saints by his sole authority, gave, in this century, the first specimen of this ghostly power; for in the preceding ages there is no example of his having exercised this privilege alone. This specimen was given in the year 993, by JOHN XV, who, with all the formalities of a solemn canonization, enrolled UDALRIC, bishop of *Augsburg*, in the number of the saints, and thus conferred upon him a title to the worship and veneration of Christians [x]. We must not, however, conclude from hence, that after this period the privilege of canonizing new saints was vested solely in the Roman pontiffs [y]; for there are several examples upon record which prove, that not only provincial councils, but also several of the first order among the bishops, advanced to the rank of saints, such as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celestial patrons of the church, without ever consulting the Roman pontiff, until the xiiith century [z]. Then ALEXANDER III abrogated this privilege of the bishops and councils, and placed *canonization* in the number of the more important acts of authority [a], which the sovereign pontiff alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exercise.

[x] FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 259.

[y] This absurd opinion has been maintained with warmth by PHIL. BONNANUS, in his *Numismata Pontif. Romanorum*, tom. i. p. 41.

[z] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 260. tom. iii. p. 30.—ARM. DE LA CHAPELLE, *Biblioth. Angloise*, tom. x. p. 105.—MABILLON, *Præfat. ad Sæc. v. Benedictin.* p. 53.

[a] These were called the *Causæ Majores*.

V. The expositors and commentators, who attempted in this century to illustrate and explain the sacred writings, were too mean in their abilities, and too unsuccessful in their undertakings to deserve almost any notice; for it is extremely uncertain, whether or no the works of OLYMPIODORUS and OECUMENIUS are to be considered as the productions of this age. Among the Latins REMI or REMIGIUS, bishop of *Auxerre*, continued the exposition of the holy scriptures, which he had begun in the preceding century; but his work is highly defective in various respects; for he takes very little pains in explaining the literal sense of the words, and employs the whole force of his fantastic genius in unfolding their pretended mystical signification, which he looked upon as infinitely more interesting than their plain and literal meaning. Besides, his explications are rarely the fruit of his own genius and invention, but are, generally speaking, mere compilations from ancient commentators. As to the *Moral observations of Odo upon the book of Job* [b], they are transcribed from a work of GREGORY the Great, which bears the same title. We mention no more; if, however, any are desirous of an ample account of those who were esteemed the principal commentators in this century, they will find it in a book wrote professedly upon this subject by NOTKERUS BALBULUS.

CENT. X.

The merit of the commentators of this century considered.

VI. The science of theology was absolutely abandoned in this century, nor did either the Greek or Latin church furnish any writer, who attempted to explain in a regular method the doctrines of Christianity. The Greeks were contented with the works of DAMASCENUS, and the Latins with those of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY, who were now considered as the greatest doctors that had adorned the church. Some added to these the writings of venerable BEDE and RABANUS MAURUS. The important science of morals was still more neglected than that of theology in this wretched age, and was reduced to a certain number of dry and insipid homilies,

The state of theology and morals in this century.

[b] *Moralia in Jobum.*

CENT. X. and to the lives of the saints, which SIMEON among the Greeks, and HUBALD, ODO, and STEPHEN [c] among Latins, had drawn up with a seducing eloquence, that covered the most impertinent fictions. Such was the miserable state of morals and theology in this century; in which, as we may farther observe, there did not appear any defence of the Christian religion against its professed enemies.

The contro-
versies be-
tween the
Greek and
Latin churches.

VII. The controversies between the Greek and Latin churches were now carried on with less noise and impetuosity than in the preceding century, on account of the troubles and calamities of the times; yet they were not entirely reduced to silence [d]. The writers therefore who affirm, that this unhappy schism was healed, and that the contending parties were really reconciled to each other for a certain space of time, have grossly mistaken the matter [e]; though it be, indeed, true, that the tumults of the times produced now and then a cessation of these contests, and occasioned several truces, which insidiously concealed the bitterest enmity, and served often as a mask to the most treacherous designs. The Greeks were, moreover, divided among themselves, and disputed with great warmth concerning the lawfulness of repeated marriages [f], to which violent contest the case of LEO, surnamed the *Philosopher*, gave rise. This emperor, having buried successively three wives without having had by them any male-issue, espoused a fourth, whose name was ZOE CARBINOPSINA, and who was born in the obscurity of a mean condition. As marriages repeated for the fourth time were held to be impure and unlawful by the Greek canons, NICOLAS, the patriarch of Con-

[c] Bishop of Liege.

[d] MICH. LE QUIEN, *Dissert. i. Damascanica de processione Spiritus Sancti*, § xiii. p. 12.—FRED. SPANHEIM, *De perpetua dissensione Ecclesiæ Oriental. et Occidental.* part. iv. § vii. p. 529. tom. ii. Opp.

[e] LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua consensione Ecclesiæ Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. vii, viii. p. 600.

[(f)] Fourth marriages, our author undoubtedly means, since second and third nuptials were allowed upon certain conditions.]

Constantinople,

Constantinople, suspended the emperor, upon this occasion, from the communion of the church. LEO, incensed at this rigorous proceeding, deprived NICOLAS of the patriarchal dignity, and raised EUTHYMIUS to that high office; who, though he re-admitted the emperor to the bosom of the church, yet opposed the law which he had resolved to enact in order to render fourth marriages lawful. Upon this a schism, attended with the bitterest animosities, divided the clergy, one part of which declared for NICOLAS, the other for EUTHYMIUS. Some time after this, LEO died, and was succeeded in the empire by ALEXANDER, who deposed EUTHYMIUS, and restored NICOLAS to his eminent rank in the church. No sooner was this warm patriarch re-instated in his office, than he began to load the memory of the late emperor with the bitterest execrations and the most opprobrious invectives, and to maintain the unlawfulness of fourth marriages with the utmost obstinacy. In order to appease these tumults, which portended numberless calamities to the state, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, the son of LEO, called together an assembly of the clergy at *Constantinople* in the year 920, in which fourth marriages were absolutely prohibited, and marriages for the third time were permitted on certain conditions; and thus the public tranquillity was restored [g].

Several other contests of like moment arose among the Greeks during this century, and they serve to convince us of the ignorance that prevailed among that people, and of their blind veneration and zeal for the opinions of their ancestors.

[g] These facts are faithfully collected from CEDRENUS, LEUNCLAVIUS *Jure Græco-Rom.* tom. i. p. 104. from LEO the grammarian, SIMEON the treasurer, and other writers of the Byzantine history.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

Ceremonies multiplied.

I. IN order to have some notion of the load of ceremonies, under which the Christian religion groaned during this superstitious age, we have only to cast an eye upon the acts of the various councils which were assembled in *England, Germany, France, and Italy*. The number of ceremonies increased in proportion to that of the saints, which multiplied from day to day; for each new saintly patron had appropriated to his service, a new festival, a new form of worship, a new round of religious rites; and the clergy, notwithstanding their gross stupidity in other matters, discovered, in the creation of new ceremonies, a marvellous fertility of invention, attended with the utmost dexterity and artifice. It is also to be observed, that a great part of these new rites derived their origin from the various errors, which the barbarous nations had received from their ancestors, and still retained, even after their conversion to Christianity. The clergy, instead of extirpating these errors, either gave them a Christian aspect by inventing certain religious rites to cover their deformity, or by explaining them in a forced allegorical manner; and thus they were perpetuated in the church and devoutly transmitted from age to age. We may also attribute a considerable number of the rites and institutions, that dishonoured religion, in this century, to foolish notions both concerning the supreme Being, and departed saints; for they imagined that God, was like the princes and great ones of the earth, who are rendered propitious by costly presents, and are delighted with those cringing salutations, and other marks of veneration and homage which they receive from their subjects; and they believed likewise that departed spirits were agreeably affected with the same kind of services.

II. The

II. The famous yearly festival that was celebrated in CENT. X. remembrance of *all departed souls*, was instituted by the authority of ODILO, abbot of *Cluni*, and added to the Latin calendar towards the conclusion of this century [b]. Before this time a custom had been introduced in many places of putting up prayers, on certain days, for the souls that were confined in purgatory; but these prayers were made by each religious society, only for its own members, friends, and patrons. The pious zeal of ODILO could not be confined within such narrow limits, and he therefore extended the benefit of these prayers to all the souls, that laboured under the pains and trials of *purgatory* [i]. This proceeding of ODILO was owing to the exhortations of a certain Sicilian hermit, who pretended to have learned, by an immediate revelation from heaven, that the prayers of the monks of *Cluni* would be effectual for the deliverance of departed spirits from the expiatory flames of a middle state [k]. Accordingly this festival was, at first, celebrated only by the *congregation of Cluni*; but having received afterwards the approbation of one of the Roman pontiffs, it was, by his order, kept with particular devotion in all the Latin churches.

Festivals.

III. The worship of the Virgin MARY, which, before this century, had been carried to a very high degree of idolatry, received now new accessions of solemnity and superstition. Towards the conclusion of this century, a custom was introduced among the Latins of cele-

The office of the Virgin Mary.

[b] In the year 998.

[i] See MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. vi. part. i. p. 584.* where the reader will find the *Life of Odilo*, with the decree issued forth for the institution of this festival.

[k] The late pontiff BENEDICT XIV, was artful enough to observe a profound silence with respect to the superstitious and dishonourable origin of this anniversary festival, in his treatise *De Fæstis J. Christi, Mariæ, et Sanctorum*, lib. iii. cap. xxii. p. 671. tom. x. Oper. and by this silence he has plainly shewn to the world what he thought of this absurd festival. This is not the only mark of prudence and cunning, that is to be found in the works of that famous pontiff.

CENT. X. brating masses and abstaining from flesh in honour of the blessed Virgin, every Sabbath day. After this was instituted, what the Latins called, the *lesser office*, in honour of St. MARY, which was, in the following century, confirmed by URBAN II, in the council of *Clermont*. There are also to be found in this age manifest indications of the institution of the *rosary*, and *crown* of the Virgin, by which her worshippers were to reckon the number of prayers that they were to offer to this new divinity; for though some place the invention of the *rosary* in the XIIIth century, and attribute it to St. DOMINIC, yet this supposition is made without any foundation [1]. The *rosary* consists in fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and an hundred and fifty salutations of the blessed Virgin; while the *crown*, according to the different opinions of the learned concerning the age of the blessed Virgin, consists in six or seven repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and six or seven times ten salutations, or *Ave Maria's*.

Institution
of the rosary.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the heresies and divisions that troubled the church during this century.

Ancient heresies continue.

I. **T**HE profound ignorance and stupidity, that were productive of so many evils in this century, had, at least, this advantage attending them, that they contributed much to the tranquillity of the church, and preventing the rise of new sects and new commotions of a religious kind. But, though no new inventions were broached, the ancient errors still remained. The Nestorians and Monophysites lived still under the Arabian government, where, however, they were much more rigorously treated than in former times, and were often persecuted with the utmost injustice and violence. But as some of them excelled in medical knowledge, which was highly esteemed among the Arabians, while

[1] This is demonstrated by MABILLON, *Præf. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. v. p. 58.*

others

others rendered themselves acceptable to the great, by the dextrous management of their domestic affairs, as overseers and stewards, all this contributed to diminish the violence of the storms that arose against them from time to time.

II. The Manichæans or Paulicians, whose errors have been already pointed out, gathered considerable strength in *Thrace* under the reign of JOHN TZIMISCES. A great part of this sect had been transported into this province, by the order of CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, so early as the seventh century, to put an end to the troubles and tumults they had excited in the east; but a still greater number of them were left behind, especially in *Syria* and the adjacent countries. Hence it was, that THEODORE, bishop of *Antioch*, from a pious apprehension of the danger to which his flock lay exposed from the neighbourhood of such pernicious heretics, engaged the emperor, by his ardent and importunate solicitations, to send a new colony of these Manichæans from *Syria* to *Philippi* [m]. From *Thrace* this restless and turbulent sect passed into *Bulgaria* and *Sclavonia*, where they resided under the jurisdiction of their own pontiff, or patriarch, until the time of the council of *Basil*, i. e. until the xvth century. From *Bulgaria* the Paulicians removed into *Italy*, and spreading themselves from thence through the other provinces of *Europe*, they became extremely troublesome to the Roman pontiffs upon many occasions [n].

The Paulicians.

III. In the very last year of this century arose a certain teacher, whose name was LEUTARD, who lived at *Vertus*, in the diocese of *Chalons*, and, in a short time, drew after him a considerable number of disciples. This new doctor could not bear the superstitious worship of images, which he is said to have opposed with the utmost vehemence, and even to have broke in pieces an image of CHRIST, which he found in a church where

Troubles excited by Leutard.

[m] Jo. ZONARAS *Annal.* lib. xvii. p. 209. edit. *Parif.* p. 164. edit. *Venet.*

[n] It is extremely probable, as we have already had occasion to observe, that the remains of this sect are still to be found in *Bulgaria*.

he

CENT. X. he went to perform his devotions. He, moreover, exclaimed with the greatest warmth against paying tythes to the priests, and in several other respects shewed that he was no cordial friend to the sacerdotal order. But that which shewed evidently that he was a dangerous fanatic, was his affirming that in the prophecies of the Old Testament there was a manifest mixture of truth and falshood. GEBOUIN, bishop of *Chalons*, examined the pretensions which this man made to divine inspiration, and exposed his extravagance to the view of the public, whom he had so artfully seduced; upon which he threw himself into a well, and ended his days as many fanatics have done after him [o]. It is highly probable, that this upstart doctor taught many other absurd notions besides those which we have now mentioned, and that after his death, his disciples made a part of the sect that was afterwards known in *France* under the name of the Albigenses, and which is said to have adopted the Manichæan errors.

The Anthropomorphites.

IV. There were yet subsisting some remains of the sect of the Arians in several parts of *Italy*, and particularly in the territory of *Padua*; but RATHERIUS, bishop of *Verona*, had still a more enormous heresy to combat in the system of the Anthropomorphites, which was revived in the year 939. In the district of *Vicenza*, a considerable number not only of the illiterate multitude, but also of the sacerdotal order, fell into that most absurd and extravagant notion, that the Deity was clothed with a human form, and seated like an earthly monarch, upon a throne of gold, and that his angelic ministers were men arrayed in white garments, and furnished with wings to render them more expeditious in executing their sovereign's orders. This monstrous error will appear less astonishing, when we consider, that the stupid and illiterate multitude had constantly before their eyes in all the churches, the supreme Being and his angels represented in pictures and images with the human figure.

[o] All this is related by GLABER RADULPHUS *Hist.* lib. ii. cap. xi.

The superstition of another set of blinded wretches, CENT. X.
mentioned also by RATHERIUS, was yet more unaccountable and absurd than that of the Anthropomorphites; for they imagined that, every Monday, mass was performed in heaven by St. MICHAEL in the presence of God, and hence on that day they resorted in crowds to all the churches which were dedicated to that highly honoured saint [p]. It is more than probable, that the avarice of the priests, who officiated in the church of St. MICHAEL, was the real source of this extravagant fancy; and that in this, as in many other cases, a rapacious clergy took advantage of the credulity of the people, and made them believe whatever they thought would contribute to augment the opulence of the church.

[p] RATHERII *Epist. Synodica* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Scrip. Veter.* tom. ii. p. 294.—SIGEBERTUS *Gemblac. Chronol. ad A. 939.*

T H E
ELEVENTH CENTURY.

P A R T I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

C H A P T E R I.

*Concerning the prosperous events which happened to the
church during this century.*

CENT. XI.

Christianity
propagated.

I. **I**N the preceding century some faint notions of the Christian religion, some scattered rays of that divine light which it administers to mortals had been received among the Hungarians, Danes, Poles, and Russians; but the rude and savage spirit of these nations, together with their deplorable ignorance and their violent attachment to the superstitions of their ancestors, rendered their total conversion to Christianity a work of great difficulty, and which could not be accomplished all of a sudden. The zeal, however, with which this important work was carried on, did much honour to the piety of the princes and governors of these unpolished countries, who united their influence with the labours of the learned men whom they had invited into their dominions, in order to open the eyes of their subjects upon the truth [a]. In *Tartary* [b], and the adja-

[a] For an account of the Poles, Russians, and Hungarians, see ROMUALDI *Vita in Actis Sanctor.* tom. ii. Februar. p. 113, 114. 117.

[b] *Tartary* is taken here in its most comprehensive sense; for between the inhabitants of *Tartary*, properly so called, and the Calmucs, Mogols, and the inhabitants of *Tangut*, there is a manifest difference.

cent countries, the zeal and diligence of the Nestorians CENT. XI.
gained over daily vast numbers to the profession of
Christianity. It appears also evident from a multitude
of unexceptionable testimonies, that Metropolitan pre-
lates, with with a great number of inferior bishops un-
der their jurisdiction, were established at this time in the
provinces of *Casgar*, *Nuacheta*, *Turkestan*, *Genda*, and
Tangut [c]; from which we may conclude, that, in this
and the following century, there was a prodigious num-
ber of Christians in those very countries, which are at
present over-run with mahometanism and idolatry. All
these Christians were undoubtedly Nestorians, and lived
under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of that sect, who
resided in *Chaldæa*.

II. Among the European nations that lay yet grovel-
ing in their native darkness and superstition, were the
Slavonians, the Obotriti [d], the Venedi [e], and the
Prussians, whose conversion had been attempted, but
with little or no success, by certain missionaries, from
whose piety and zeal better fruits might have been ex-

The conver-
sion of cer-
tain nations
attempted in
vain.

[c] MARCUS PAUL. VENETUS *De Regionibus Orientalibus*, lib. i.
cap. 38. 40. 45. 47, 48, 49. 62, 63, 64. lib. ii. cap. 39.—EUSEB.
RENAUDOT *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine*, p. 420—JOS.
SIMON. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* torn. iii. part. II. p. D.
11, &c. This successful propagation of the gospel, by the ministry
of the Nestorians, in *Tartary*, *China*, and the neighbouring provinces,
is a most important event, and every way worthy to employ the re-
searches and the pen of some able writer, well versed in the knowledge
of oriental history. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that, if this
subject be important, it is also difficult on many accounts. It was
attempted, however, notwithstanding its difficulty by the most learned
THEOPH. SIGIFRED. BAYER, who had collected a great quantity of
materials relative to this interesting branch of the history of Christianity,
both from the works that have been published upon this subject, and
from manuscripts that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious.
But, unhappily for the republic of letters, the death of that excellent
man interrupted his labours, and prevented him from executing a de-
sign, which was worthy of his superior abilities, and his well-known zeal,
for the interests of religion.

[(d) The Obotriti were a great and powerful branch of the Van-
dals, whose kings resided in the country of *Mecklenburg*, and whose do-
mination extended along the coasts of the *Baltic* from the river *Pene* in
Pomerania to the dutchy of *Holstein*.]

[(e) The Venedi dwelt upon the banks of the *Weissel*, or *Vistula*,
in, what is at present called, the Palatinate of *Marienburg*.]

pected.

CENT. XI. peſted. Towards the concluſion of the preceding century, ADALBERT, biſhop of *Prague*, had endeavoured to inſtil into the minds of the fierce and ſavage Pruſſians, the ſalutary doctrines of the goſpel: but he periſhed in the fruitleſs attempt, and received, in the year 996, from the murdering lance of SIGGO, a Pagan prieſt, the crown of martyrdom [*f*]. BOLES- LAUS, king of *Poland*, revenged the death of his pious apoſtle by entering into a bloody war with the Pruſſians, and he obtained by the force of penal laws and of a victorious army, what ADALBERT could not effect by exhortation and argument [*g*]. He dragooned this ſavage people into the Chriſtian church, yet beſides this violent method of converſion, others of a more gentle kind kind were certainly practiſed by the attendants of BOLES LAUS, who ſecoded the military arguments of their prince by the more perſuaſive influence of admonition and inſtruction. A certain eccleſiaſtic of illuſtrious birth, whoſe name was BONIFACE, and who was one of the diſciples of St. ROMUALD, undertook the converſion of the Pruſſians, and was ſucceeded in this pious enterprize by BRUNO [*b*], who ſet out from *Germany* with a company of eighteen perſons who had entered with zeal into the ſame laudable deſign. Theſe were, however, all barbarouſly maſſacred by the fierce and cruel Pruſſians, and neither the vigorous efforts of BOLES LAUS, nor of the ſucceeding kings of *Poland*, could engage this rude and inflexible nation to abandon totally the idolatry of their anceſtors [*i*].

[*f*] See the *Acta Sanctor. ad d. xxiii Aprilis*, p. 174.

[*g*] SOLIGNAC *Hift. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 133.

[(*b*) FLEURY differs from Dr. MOSHEIM in his account of *Bruno*, in two points. Firſt he maintains, that *Boniface* and *Bruno* were one and the ſame perſon, and here he is manifeſtly in the right; but he maintains farther, that he ſuffered martyrdom in *Ruſſia*, in which he is evidently miſtaken. It is proper farther to admoniſh the reader to diſtinguiſh carefully the *Bruno* here mentioned, from a monk of the ſame name, who founded the order of the Carthuſians.]

[*i*] ANT. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iv. *ad Annum* 1008. p. 97.—CHRIST. HARTKNOCH'S *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Pruſſia*, book I. ch. i. p. 12.

III. *Sicily* had been groaning under the dominion of CENT. XI. the Saracens since the ixth century, nor had the repeated attempts of the Greeks and Latins to dispossess them of that rich and fertile country, been hitherto crowned with the desired success. But in this century the face of affairs changed entirely in that island; for in the year 1059, ROBERT GUISCARD, who had formed a settlement in *Italy* at the head of a Norman colony, and was afterwards created duke of *Apulia*, encouraged by the exhortations of the Roman pontiff NICOLAS II, and seconded by the assistance of his brother ROGER, attacked with the greatest vigour and intrepidity the Saracens in *Sicily*; nor did this latter sheath the victorious sword, before he had rendered himself master of that island, and cleared it absolutely of its former tyrants. As soon as this great work was accomplished, which was not before the year 1090, Count ROGER not only restored to its former glory and lustre the Christian religion, which had been almost totally extinguished under the Saracen yoke, but also established bishoprics, founded monasteries, erected magnificent churches throughout that province, and bestowed upon the clergy those immense revenues and those distinguished honours which they still enjoy [k]. It is in the privileges conferred upon this valiant chief, that we find the origin of that supreme authority in matters of religion, which is still vested in the kings of *Sicily*, within the limits of their own territories, and which is known by the name of the *Sicilian monarchy*; for the Roman pontiff URBAN II, is said to have granted, A. D. 1097 by a special diploma, to ROGER and his successors the title, authority, and prerogatives of hereditary legates of the apostolic see. The court of *Rome* affirms, that this diploma is not authentic: and hence those warm contentions, about the spiritual supremacy, that have arisen even in our times between the bishops of *Rome* and the kings of *Sicily*. The successors of ROGER governed that island, under the title of dukes, until the

The Saracens driven out of Sicily.

[k] See BURIGNI *Histoire Generale de la Sicile*, tom i. p. 386.

CENT. XI. XIth century, when it was erected into a kingdom
[1].

Expeditions
formed a-
gainst the
Saracens in
Palestine.

IV. The Roman pontiffs, from the time of SILVESTER II, had been forming plans for extending the limits of the church in *Asia*, and especially for driving the Mahometans out of *Palestine*; but the troubles, in which *Europe* was so long involved, prevented the execution of these arduous designs. GREGORY VII, the most enterprising and audacious pontiff that ever sat in the Apostolic chair, animated and inflamed by the repeated complaints which the Asiatic Christians made of the cruelty of the Saracens, resolved to undertake in person a holy war for the deliverance of the church, and upwards of fifty thousand men were already mustered to follow him in this bold expedition [m]. But his quarrel with the emperor HENRY IV, of which we shall have occasion to speak hereafter, and other unforeseen occurrences, obliged him to lay aside his intended invasion of the holy land. The project, however, was renewed, towards the conclusion of this century, by the enthusiastic zeal of an inhabitant of *Amiens*, who was known by the name of PETER the Hermit, and who suggested to the Roman pontiff URBAN II the means of accomplishing what had been unluckily suspended. This famous hermit, in a voyage which he had made through *Palestine* A. D. 1093, had observed, with inexpressible anguish, the vexations and persecutions which the Christians, who visited the holy places, suffered from the barbarous and tyrannic Saracens. Inflamed therefore with a holy indignation and a furious zeal, which he looked upon as the effects of a divine impulse, he implored the succours of SYMEON, patriarch of *Constantinople*, and URBAN II, but without effect. Far from being discouraged by this, he renewed his efforts with the utmost vigour, went through all the countries of *Europe* sounding the alarm of a *holy war* against the infidel nations, and exhorting

[1] See BARONII *Liber de Monarchia Siciliae*, tom. xi. *Annal.* as also DU PIN *Traité de la Monarchie Sicilienne*.

[m] GREGORII VII *Epist.* lib. ii. 3. in HARDUINI *Conciliis*, tom. vi. part. I. p. 1285.

all Christian princes to draw the sword against the tyrants of *Palestine*; nor did he stop here; but with a view to engage the superstitious and ignorant multitude in his cause, he carried about with him a letter, which he said was written in heaven, and addressed from thence to all true Christians to animate their zeal for the deliverance of their brethren, who groaned under the oppressive burthen of a Mahometan yoke [n].

V. When URBAN II saw the way prepared by the exhortations of the hermit, who had put the spirits of the people every where in a ferment, and had kindled in their breasts a vehement zeal for that holy carnage which the church had been meditating so long, he assembled a grand and numerous council at *Placentia* A. D. 1095, and recommended warmly, for the first time, the sacred expedition against the infidel Saracens [o]. This arduous enterprize was far from being approved of by the greatest part of this numerous assembly, notwithstanding the presence of the emperor's legates, who, in their master's name, represented most pathetically how necessary it was to set limits to the power of the victorious Turks, whose authority and dominion increased from day to day. The pontiff's proposal was, however, renewed with the same zeal, and with the desired success, some time after this, in the council assembled at *Clermont*, where URBAN was present. The pompous and pathetic speech, which he delivered upon this occasion, made a deep and powerful impression upon the minds of the French, whose natural character renders them much superior to the Italians in encountering difficulties, facing danger, and attempting the execution of the most perilous designs. So that an innumerable

The progress
of the holy
war.

[n] This circumstance is mentioned by the abbot DODECHINUS, in his *Continuat. Chronici Mariani Scoti Scriptor. Germanicor.* JO. PISTORIUS, tom. i. p. 462. For an account of PETER, see DU FRESNE *Notæ ad Annæ Comnenæ Alexiadem*, p. 79. edit. Venet.

[(o) This council was the most numerous of any that had been hitherto assembled, and was, on that account, held in the open fields. There were present at it two hundred bishops, four thousand ecclesiastics, and three hundred thousand laymen.]

CENT. XI. multitude, composed of all ranks and orders in the nation, offered themselves as volunteers in this sacred expedition [p]. This numerous host was looked upon as formidable in the highest degree, and equal to the most glorious enterprizes and exploits, while, in reality, it was no more than an unwieldy body without life and vigour, and was weak and contemptible in every respect. This will appear sufficiently evident, when we consider that this army was a motley assemblage of monks, whores, artists, labourers, lazy tradesmen, merchants, boys, girls, slaves, malefactors, and profligate debauchees, and that it was principally composed of the lowest dregs of the multitude, who were animated solely by the prospect of spoil and plunder, and hoped to make their fortunes by this holy campaign. Every one will perceive how little either discipline, council, or fortitude were to be expected from such a miserable rabble. This expedition was distinguished by the name of a *croisade*, and all who embarked in it were called *croise's*, or cross-bearers; not only because the end of this holy war was to wrest the cross of CHRIST out of the hands of the infidels, but also on account of the consecrated cross of various colours, which every soldier wore upon his right shoulder [q].

The history
of this holy
war.

VI. In consequence of these grand preparations, eight hundred thousand men, in separate bodies, and under different commanders, set out for *Constantinople* in the year 1096; that having received there both assistance and direction from ALEXIS COMNENIUS the Grecian emperor, they might pursue their march into *Asia*. One of the principal divisions of this enormous body was led on by PETER the hermit, the author and fomentor of

[p] THEOD. RUINART, in *Vita Urbani II*, § ccxxv. p. 224. 299. 240. 272. 274. 282. 296. tom. iii. Opp. Posthum.—JO. MABILLON et THEOD. RUINARTI, JO. HARDUINI *Concilior.* tom. xi. part. II. p. 1726.—BARONIUS *Annal. Eccl. xi. ad A. 1095. n. xxxii.* p. 648.

[q] See ABRAM. BZOVIVS *Continuat. Annal. Baronii*, tom. xv. ad A. 1410. n. ix. p. 322. ed. Colon—L'ENFANT *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, tom. ii. lib. v. p. 60.—The writers who have treated of this holy war are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toto orbe exorients*, cap. xxx. p. 518.

the war, who was girded with a rope, and continued to appear with all the marks of an austere solitary. This first division, in their march through *Hungary* and *Thrace*, committed the most flagitious crimes, which so incensed the inhabitants of the countries through which they passed, particularly those of *Hungary* and *Turcomania*, that they rose up in arms and massacred the greatest part of them. A like fate attended several other divisions of the same army, who, under the conduct of weak and unskilful chiefs, wandered about like an undisciplined band of robbers, plundering the cities that lay in their way, and spreading misery and desolation wherever they came. The armies, that were headed by illustrious commanders, distinguished by their birth and their military endowments, arrived more happily at the capital of the Grecian empire. That which was commanded by GODFREY of *Bouillon*, duke of *Lorraine*, who deserves a place among the greatest heroes, whether of ancient or modern times [r], and, by his brother BALDWIN, was composed of eighty thousand well chosen troops, horse and foot [s], and directed its march through *Germany*

[r] The Benedictine monks have given an ample account of this magnanimous chief, whose character was a bright assemblage of all christian, civil, and heroic virtues, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 598.

[s] The engaging and illustrious virtues of GODFREY had drawn from all parts a prodigious number of volunteers, who were ambitious to fight under his standards. The enormous multitude perplexed, however, the valiant chief, who, on that account, divided it into several bodies, and finding in PETER the Hermit the same ambitious and military spirit that had prevailed in him before his retreat from the world, declared him the general of the first division, which was detached from the rest, and ordered to march immediately to *Constantinople*. By this means, GODFREY got rid of the dregs of that astonishing multitude which flocked to his camp. Father MAIMBOURG, notwithstanding his immoderate zeal for the holy war, and that fabulous turn which enables him to represent it in the most favourable points of view, acknowledges frankly, that the first divisions of this prodigious army committed the most abominable enormities in the countries through which they passed, and that there was no kind of insolence, injustice, impurity, barbarity, and violence of which they were not guilty. Nothing prehaps in the annals of history can equal the flagitious deeds of this infernal rabble. See particularly MAIMBOURG, *Histoire de Croisades*, tom. i. livre i. p. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62. 2d edit. in 12mo.]

CENT. XI. and *Hungary*. Another, which was headed by RAIMOND, earl of *Toulouse*, passed through the Slavonian territories. ROBERT earl of *Flanders*, ROBERT duke of *Normandy* [t], HUGO, brother to PHILIP I, king of *France*, embarked their respective forces in a fleet which was assembled at *Brundisi* and *Tarento*, from whence they were transported to *Durazzo*, or *Dyrrachium*, as it was anciently called. These armies were followed by BOEMOND, duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, at the head of a chosen and numerous body of valiant Normans.

VII. This army was the greatest, and, in outward appearance, the most formidable, that had been known in the memory of man; and, though before its arrival at *Constantinople*, it was diminished considerably by the difficulties and oppositions it had met with on the way; yet such as it was, it made the Grecian emperor tremble, and filled his mind with the most anxious and terrible apprehensions of some secret design against his dominions. His fears, however, were dispelled, when he saw these legions pass the straits of *Gallipolis*, and direct their march towards *Bithynia* [u].

The first successful enterprize [w] that was formed

[(t) Eldest son of WILLIAM the Conqueror.]

[(u) Our author, for the sake of brevity, passes over the contests and jealousies that subsisted between the chief of the crusade and the Grecian emperor. The character of the latter is differently painted by different historians. The warm defenders of the crusade represent him as a most perfidious prince, who, under the shew of friendship and zeal, aimed at nothing less than the destruction of GODFREY's army. Others considered him as a wise prudent politician, who, by artifice and stratagem, warded off the danger he had reason to apprehend from these formidable legions that passed through his dominions; and part of which, particularly the army commanded by PETER the Hermit, ravaged his most fruitful territories in the most barbarous manner, and pillaged and plundered even the suburbs of the capital of the empire. The truth of the matter is, that if ALEXIS cannot be vindicated from the charge of perfidy, the holy warriors are on the other hand, chargeable with many acts of brutality and injustice. See MAIMBURG, *Histoire des Croisades*, livre i. et ii.]

[(w) Before the arrival of GODFREY in *Asia*, the army, or rather rabble, commanded by PETER the Hermit in such a ridiculous manner as might be expected from a wrongheaded monk, was defeated and cut to pieces by the young SOLIMAN.]

against

against the infidels, was the siege of *Nice*, the capital of *Cent.XI.*
Bitynia, which was taken in the year 1097; from thence
the victorious army proceeded into *Syria*, and, in the
following year, subdued *Antioch*, which, with its fertile
territory, was granted, by the assembled chiefs, to
BOEMOND, duke of *Apulia*. *Edeffa* fell next into the
hands of the victors, and became the property of BALD-
WIN, brother to GODFREY of *Bouillon*. The conquest
of *Jerusalem*, which, after a siege of five weeks, sub-
mitted to their arms in the year 1099, seemed to crown
their expedition with the desired success. In this city
were laid the foundations of a new kingdom, at the
head of which was placed the famous GODFREY, whom
the army saluted king of *Jerusalem* with an unanimous
voice. But this illustrious hero, whose other eminent
qualities were adorned with the greatest modesty, refus-
ed that high title [x], though he governed *Jerusalem*
with that valour, equity, and prudence, that have ren-
dered his name immortal. Having chosen a small army
to support him in his new dignity, he permitted the rest
of the troops to return into *Europe*. He did not how-
ever, enjoy long the fruits of a victory, in which his
heroic valour had been so gloriously displayed, but died
about a year after the conquest of *Jerusalem*, leaving
his dominions to his brother BALDWIN, prince of
Edeffa, who assumed the title of king without the least
hesitation.

VIII. If we examine the motives that engaged the
Roman pontiffs, and particularly URBAN II, to kindle
this holy war, which in its progress and issue was so
detrimental to almost all the countries of *Europe*, we
shall probably be persuaded that its origin is to be de-
rived from the corrupt notions of religion, which pre-
vailed in those barbarous times. It was thought incon-

The motives
which en-
gaged the bi-
shops of *Rome*
and the
princes of
Europe in
this holy
war.

[(x) All the historians, who write concerning this holy war, ap-
plaud the answer which GODFREY returned to the offer that was made
him of a crown of gold, as a mark of his accession to the throne of
Jerusalem; the answer was, that he could not bear the thoughts of wear-
ing a crown of gold in that city, where the KING OF KINGS had been
crowned with thorns. This answer was sublime in the xth century.

sistent with the duty and character of Christians, to suffer that land, that was blessed with the ministry, distinguished by the miracles, and consecrated by the blood of the Saviour of men, to remain under the dominion of his most inveterate enemies. It was also looked upon as a very important branch of true piety to visit the holy places in *Palestine*; which pilgrimages, however, were extremely dangerous, while the despotic Saracens were in possession of that country. Nor will we deny, that these motives of a religious kind were accompanied and rendered more effectual by an anxious apprehension of the growing power of the Turks, who had already subdued the greatest part of the Grecian empire, and might soon carry into *Europe*, and more particularly into *Italy*, their victorious arms.

There are, it must be confessed, several learned men who have accounted otherwise for this pious, or rather fanatical, expedition. They imagine that the Roman pontiffs recommended this sacred campaign with a view to augment their own authority, and to weaken the power of the Latin emperors and princes; and that these princes countenanced and encouraged it in hopes of getting rid, by that means, of their more powerful and warlike vassals, and of becoming masters of their lands and possessions [y]. These conjectures, however plausible

[y] The part of this hypothesis, that relates to the views of the Roman pontiffs, has been adopted as an undoubted truth, not only by many protestant historians, but also by several writers of the Roman communion. See BENED. ACCOLTUS *De bello Sacro in Infideles*, lib. i. p. 16.—BASNAGE *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i. period. v. p. 235.—VERTOT *Histoire des Chevaliers de Malthe*, tom. i. livre iii. p. 302. 308. livre iv. p. 428.—BAILLET *Histoire des demelez du Boniface VIII, avec Philippe le Bel*, p. 76.—*Histoire du droit Ecclesiastique François*, tom. i. 296. 299. To such, however, as consider matters attentively, this hypothesis will appear destitute of any solid foundation. Certain it is, that the Roman pontiffs could never have either foreseen, or imagined, that so many European princes, and such prodigious multitudes of people, would take arms against the infidels, and march into *Palestine*; nor could they be assured beforehand, that this expedition would tend to the advancement of their opulence and authority. For all the accessions of influence and wealth, which the Roman pontiffs, and the clergy in general derived

plausible in appearance, are still no more than conjectures. The truth of the matter seems to be this; that the

derived from these holy wars, were of a much later date, than their first origin, and were acquired by degrees, rather by lucky hits, than by deep laid schemes; and this alone is sufficient to shew, that the bishops of *Rome*, in forming the plan and exhorting to the prosecution of these wars, had no thoughts of extending thereby the limits of their authority. We may add to this consideration another of no less weight in the matter before us, and that is the general opinion which prevailed at this time, both among the clergy and the people, that the conquest of *Palestine* would be finished in a short time, in a single campaign; that the divine providence would interpose, in a miraculous manner, to accomplish the ruin of the infidels; and that, after the taking of *Jerusalem*, the greatest part of the European princes would return home with their troops, which last circumstance was by no means favourable to the views which the pontiffs are supposed to have formed of increasing their opulence and extending their dominion. Of all the conjectures that have been entertained upon this subject, the most improbable and groundless is that which supposes that *URBAN II.* recommended, with such ardor, this expedition into *Palestine* with a view to weaken the power of the emperor *HENRY IV.* with, whom he had a violent dispute concerning the investiture of bishops. They, who adopt this conjecture, must be little acquainted with the history of those times; or at least they forget, that the first armies, that marched into *Palestine* against the infidels, were chiefly composed of Franks and Normans, and that the Germans, who were the enemies of *URBAN II.* were, in the beginning, extremely averse to this sacred expedition. Many other considerations might be added here to illustrate this matter, which, for the sake of brevity, I pass in silence.

That part of the hypothesis, which relates to the kings and princes of *Europe*, and supposes that they countenanced the holy war, to get rid of their powerful vassals, is as groundless as the other, which we have been now refuting. It is, indeed, adopted by several eminent writers, such as *VERTOT* (*Hist. de Malthe*, livre iii. p. 309.) *BouLAINVILLIERS*, and others, who pretend to a superior and uncommon insight into the policy of those remote ages. The reasons, however, which these great men employ to support their opinion, may be all comprehended in this single argument: *viz.* "Many kings, especially among the Franks, became more opulent and powerful by the numbers of their vassals, who lost their lives and fortunes in this holy war; therefore, these princes not only permitted, but warmly countenanced the prosecution of this war from selfish and ambitious principles." The weakness of this conclusion must strike every one at first sight. We are wonderfully prone to attribute both to the Roman pontiffs, and the princes of this barbarous age much more sagacity and cunning, than they really possessed; and we deduce from the events, the principles and views of the actors, which is a

CENT. XI. the Roman pontiffs and the European princes were engaged at first in these *crusades* by a principle of superstition only; but when, in process of time, they learned by experience, that these holy wars contributed much to increase their opulence and to extend their authority, by sacrificing their wealthy and powerful rivals, then new motives were presented to encourage these sacred expeditions into *Palestine*, and ambition and avarice seconded and enforced the dictates of fanaticism and superstition.

Its unhappy
consequences
and the in-
numerable
evils that at-
tended it.

IX. Without determining any thing concerning the justice or injustice [z] of these holy wars, we may boldly

defective and uncertain manner of reasoning. With respect to the Roman pontiffs, it appears most probable that their immense opulence and authority were acquired, rather by their improving dexterously the opportunities that were offered them, than by the schemes they formed for extending their dominion, or filling their coffers.

[z] I do not pretend to decide the question concerning the lawfulness of the *crusades*; a question, which, when it is considered with attention and impartiality, will appear not only extremely difficult, but also highly doubtful. It is, however, proper to inform the reader, that in the XII and XIIIth centuries the justice of this holy war was called in question, and warmly disputed among Christians. The Waldenses and Albigenses, who were distinguished by the name of Cathari, or Puritans, considered these expeditions into *Palestine* as absolutely unlawful. The reasons they alledged were collected and combated by FRANCIS MONETA, a Dominican friar of the XIIIth century, in a book entitled *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses*, lib. v. cap. xiii. p. 531. which was published some years ago at Rome by RICHINI. But neither the objections of the Waldenses, nor the answers of MONETA, were at all remarkable for their weight and solidity, as will appear evidently from the following example: The former objected to the holy war the words of St. PAUL, 1 COR. x. 32. *Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles.* By the *Gentiles*, said they, are to be understood the Saracens. And therefore the European Christians are to abstain from making war upon the Saracens, lest they give offence to the *Gentiles*. We shall give MONETA's answer to this argument in his own words: *We read*, says he, GENES. xii. 7. *that God said unto Abraham, Unto thy seed will I give this land:* Now we (Christians who dwell in Europe) are the seed of Abraham, as the apostle affirms, GALAT. iii. 29. Therefore we are heirs of the promise, and the holy land is given to us by the covenant as our lawful possession. From all which it appears, that it is the duty of civil and temporal rulers to use their most zealous efforts to put us in possession of the promised land, while it is, at the same time, incumbent upon the church and its ministers to exhort these rulers in the most urgent

ly affirm, that they were highly prejudicial both to the cause of religion, and to the civil interests of mankind, and that, in *Europe* more especially, they were fruitful of innumerable evils and calamities, whose effects are yet perceivable in our times. The European nations were deprived of the greatest part of their inhabitants by these ill-judged expeditions; immense sums of money were exported into *Asia* for the support of the war; and numbers of the most powerful and opulent families became either extinct, or were involved in the deepest miseries of poverty and want. It could not well be otherwise; since the heads of the most illustrious houses either mortgaged or sold their lands and possessions in order

urgent manner to the performance of their duty. A rare argument this truly! but let us hear him out: The church has no design to injure, or slaughter the Saracens, nor is such the intention of the Christian princes engaged in this war. Yet the blood of the infidels must of necessity be shed, if they make resistance and oppose the victorious arms of the princes. The church of God therefore is entirely innocent and without reproach in this matter, and gives no offence to the Gentiles, because it does no more, in reality, than maintain its undoubted right. Such is the subtle reasoning of MONETA, on which it is not necessary to make any reflexions.

[Dr. MOSHEIM seems too modest, nay even timorous in his manner of expressing himself concerning the justice of this holy war, which was so absurd in its principle, and so abominable in the odious circumstances that attended it. His respect, perhaps, for the Teutonic crosses which abound in *Germany*, and are the marks of an order which derives its origin from these fanatical expeditions into *Palestine*, may have occasioned that ambiguity and circumspection in his expressions, through which, however, it is easy to perceive his disapprobation of the crusades.—The holy place profaned by the dominion of infidels, was the apparent pretext of this fanatical war. What holy place? *Jerusalem*, say the knights errant of *Palestine*. But they forget that *Jerusalem* was a city, which, by the conduct of its inhabitants and the crucifixion of CHRIST, was become most odious in the eye of God; that it was visibly loaded with a divine malediction, and was the miserable theatre of the most tremendous judgments and calamities that ever were inflicted upon any nation. Had the case been otherwise, we know of no right which Christianity gives its professors to seize upon the territories, and invade the possessions of unbelievers. Had the Jews attempted the conquest of *Palestine*, they would have acted conformably with their apparent rights; because it was formerly their country, and consistently also with their religious principles; because they expected a Messiah who was to bind the kings of the gentiles in chains, and to reduce the whole world under the Jewish yoke.]

to

CENT. XI. to pay the expences of their voyage [a] ; while others imposed such intolerable burthens upon their vassals and tenants, as obliged them to abandon their houses, and all their domestic concerns, and to enlist themselves, rather through wild despair than religious zeal, under the sacred banner of the cross. Hence the face of *Europe* was totally changed, and all things thrown into the utmost confusion. We pass in silence the various enormities that were occasioned by these crusades, the murders, rapes, and robberies of the most infernal nature that were every where committed with impunity by these holy soldiers of GOD and of CHRIST, as they were impiously called ; nor shall we enter into a detail of the new privileges and rights, to which these wars gave rise, and which were often attended with the greatest inconveniencies [b].

Its unhappy effects, considered with respect to the state of religion.

X. These holy wars were not less prejudicial to the cause of religion, and the true interests of the Christian church, than they were to the temporal concerns of

[a] We find many memorable examples of this in the ancient records. ROBERT, duke of *Normandy*, mortgaged his dutchy to his brother WILLIAM, king of *England*, to defray the expences of his voyage to *Palestine*. See the *Histor. Major* of MATTHEW PARIS, lib. i. p. 24. --- ODO, viscount of *Bourges*, sold his territory to the king of *France*. *Gallia Christiana. Benedictinorum*, tom. ii. p. 45. See for many more examples of this kind CAR. DU FRESNE *Adnot. ad Joinvilli vitam Ludovici S.* p. 52. --- BOULAINVILLIER'S *Sur l'origine et les droits de la Noblesse* in MOLET'S *Memoires de Litterature et de l'Histoire*, tom. ix. part. i. p. 68. --- JO. GEORGE CRAMER *De juribus et prærogativis Nobilitatis*, tom. i. p. 81. 409. From the commencement therefore of these holy wars, a vast number of estates, belonging to the European nobility, were either mortgaged, or totally transferred, some to kings and princes, others to priests and monks, and not a few to persons of a private condition, who, by possessing considerable sums of ready money, were enabled to make advantageous purchases.

[b] Such persons, as entered into these expeditions, and were distinguished by the badge of the military cross, acquired thereby certain remarkable rights, which were extremely prejudicial to the rest of their fellow-citizens. Hence it happened, that when any of these holy soldiers contracted any civil obligations, or entered into conventions of sale, purchase, or any such transactions, they were previously required to renounce all privileges and immunities, which they had obtained or might obtain in time to come by taking on the cross. See LE BEUF *Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, Append. tom. ii. p. 292.

men.

men. One of their first and most pernicious effects was CENT. XI.
the enormous augmentation of the influence and authority of the Roman pontiffs: they also contributed, in various ways to enrich the churches and monasteries with daily accessions of wealth, and to open new sources of opulence to all the sacerdotal orders. For they, who assumed the cross, disposed of their possessions as if they were at the point of death, and this on account of the imminent and innumerable dangers they were to be exposed to in their passage to the holy land, and the opposition they were to encounter there upon their arrival [c]. They therefore, for the most part, made their wills before their departure, and left a considerable part of their possessions to the priests and monks, in order to obtain by these *pious* legacies, the favour and protection of the Deity [d]. Many examples of these donations are to be found in ancient records. Such of the *holy* soldiers, as had been engaged in suits of law with the priests or monks, renounced their pretensions, and submissively gave up whatever it was, that had been the subject of debate. And others, who had seized upon any of the possessions of the churches or convents, or had heard of any injury that had been committed against the clergy, by the remotest of their ancestors, made the most liberal restitution, both for their own usurpations and those of their fore-fathers, and made ample satisfaction for the real or pretended injuries they had committed against the church by rich and costly donations [e].

Nor were these the only unhappy effects of these holy expeditions, considered with respect to their influence upon the state of religion, and the affairs of the Christian church. For while whole legions of bishops and ab-

[(c) The translator has here inserted into the text, the note [r] of the original, as it is purely historical, and makes a very interesting part of the narration.]

[d] See PLESSIS *Hist. de Meaux*, tom. ii. p. 76. 79. 141.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. ii. p. 138, 139.—LE BEUF *Memoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. *Append.* p. 31.—DU FRESNE *Notæ ad Vitam Ludovici Sancti*, p. 52.

[e] DU FRESNE, l. c. p. 52.

CENT. XI. bots girded the sword to their thigh, and went as generals, volunteers, or chaplains into *Palestine*, the priests and monks, who had lived under their jurisdiction, and were more or less awed by their authority, threw off all restraint, lived the most lawless and profligate lives, and abandoned themselves to all sorts of licentiousness, committing the most flagitious and extravagant excesses without reluctance or remorse. The monster superstition, which was already grown to an enormous size, received new accessions of strength and influence by this holy war, and exercised with more vehemence than ever its despotic dominion over the minds of the Latins. For the crowd of saints, and tutelary patrons, whose number was prodigious before this period, was now augmented by fictitious saints of Greek and Syrian origin [f], which had hitherto been unknown in *Europe*, and an incredible quantity of relics, the greatest part of which were ridiculous in the highest degree, were imported into the European churches. The armies, that returned from *Asia* after the taking of *Jerusalem*, brought with them a vast number of these saintly relics, which they bought at a high price from the cunning Greeks and Syrians, and which they considered as the noblest spoils that could crown their return from the holy land. These they committed to the custody of the clergy, in the churches and monasteries, or ordered them to be most carefully preserved in their families from generation to generation [g].

C H A P.

[f] The Roman catholic historians acknowledge, that, during the time of the crusades, many saints, unknown to the Latins before that period, were imported into *Europe* from *Greece* and the eastern provinces, and were treated with the utmost respect, and the most devout veneration. Among these new patrons, there were some, whose exploits, and even their existence, were called in question. Such among others, was St. CATHARINE, whom BARONIUS and CASSANDER represent as having removed from *Syria* into *Europe*. See BARONIUS, *Ad Martyrol. Roman.* p. 728.—GEORGE CASSANDER, *Schol. ad hymnos Ecclesiæ*, p. 278, 279. Opp. *Paris*. 1616. *Fol.* It is, however, extremely doubtful, whether or no this CATHARINE, who is honoured as the patroness of learned men, ever existed.

[g] The sacred treasures of musty relics, which the French, Germans, Britons; and other European nations preserved formerly with so much

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

I. **T**HE greatest opposition the Christians met with, in this century, was from the Saracens, and Turks. To the latter the Christians and Saracens were equally odious, and felt equally the fatal consequences of their increasing dominion. The Saracens, notwithstanding their bloody contests with the Turks which gave them constant occupation, and the vigorous,

The sufferings of the church under the dominion and usurpations of the Saracens and Turks.

much care, and shew even in our times with such pious ostentation, are certainly not more ancient than these holy wars, but were then purchased at a high rate from the Greeks and Syrians. These cunning traders in superstition, whose avarice and fraud were excessive, imposed upon the credulity of the simple and ignorant Latins, and often sold them fictitious relics. RICHARD, king of *England*, bought, in the year 1191, from the famous SALADIN all the relics that were to be found in *Jerusalem*, as appears from the testimony of MATTHEW DE PARIS *Hist. Major*, p. 138. who tells us also, p. 666. of the same work, that the Dominicans brought from *Palestine* a white stone, in which Jesus Christ had left the print of his feet. The Genoese pretend to have received from BALDWIN, second king of *Jerusalem*, the very dish in which the paschal lamb was served up to Christ and his disciples at the last supper; though this famous dish excites the laughter of even father LABAT, in his *Voyages en Espagne et en Italie*, tom. ii. p. 63. For an account of the prodigious quantity of relics, which St. LOUIS brought from *Palestine* into *France*, we refer the reader to the life of that prince composed by JOINVILLE, and published by DU FRESNE; as also to PLESSIS *Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux*, tom. i. p. 120. and LANCELOT *Memoires pour la vie de l'Abbe de St. Cyran*, tom. ii. p. 175. CHRIST'S handkerchief, which is worshiped at *Bezançon*, was brought there from the holy land. See JO. JAC. CHIFLET. *Vesontio*. part II. p. 108. and *De Linteis Christi Sepulchralibus*, c. ix. p. 50.—Many other examples of this miserable superstition may be seen in ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 677.—JO. MABILLON *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 52. and principally CHIFLET'S *Chrisis Historica de Linteis Christi Sepulchralibus*, c. ix, x. p. 50, and also 59, where we find the following passage: *Sciendum est, vigente immani et barbara Turcarum persecutione et imminente Christianæ religionis in oriente naufragio educæ e Sacrariis et per Christianos quovis modo recondita Ecclesiæ pignora . . . Hisce plane divinis opibus illecti præ aliis, Sacra Λείψανα, qua vi, quo pretio, à detinentibus hac illac extorserunt.*

though

CENT. XI. though ineffectual, efforts they were continually making to set limits to the power of that fierce nation, which was daily extending the bounds of its empire, persisted still in their cruelty towards their Christian subjects, whom they robbed, plundered, maimed, or murdered in the most barbarous manner, and loaded with all sorts of injuries and calamities. The Turks, on the other hand, not only reduced the Saracen dominion to very narrow bounds, but also seized upon the richest provinces of the Grecian empire, those fertile countries that lay upon the coasts of the *Euxine* sea, and subjected them to their yoke, while they impoverished and exhausted the rest by perpetual incursions, and by the most severe and unmerciful exactions. The Greeks were not able to oppose this impetuous torrent of prosperous ambition. Their force was weakened by intestine discords, and their treasures were exhausted to such a degree as rendered them incapable of raising new troops, or of paying the armies they had already in their service.

And in the
western pro-
vinces.

II. The Saracens in *Spain* opposed the progress of the gospel in a different, yet still more pernicious way. They used all sorts of methods to allure the Christians into the profession of mahometanism; alliances of marriage, advantageous contracts, flattering rewards were employed to seduce them with too much success; for great numbers fell into these fatal snares, and apostatized from the truth [b]. And these allurements would have, undoubtedly, still continued to seduce multitudes of Christians from the bosom of the church, had not the face of affairs been changed in *Spain* by the victorious arms of the kings of *Arragon* and *Castile*, and more especially FERDINAND I; for these princes, whose zeal for Christianity was equal to their military courage, defeated the Saracens in several battles, and deprived them of a great part of their territories and possessions [i].

The

[b] JO. HENRY HOTTINGER *Histor. Ecclesiast. Sæc. xi. § ii. p. 452.*—MICHAEL GEDDES'S *History of the Expulsion of the Moriscoes out of Spain* which is to be found in the *Miscellaneous Tracts of that Author*, tom. i. p. 104.

[i] For account of these wars between the first Christian kings of *Spain*

The number of those among the Danes, Hungarians, CENT. XI. and other European nations, who retained their prejudices in favour of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, was, as yet, very considerable; and they persecuted, with the utmost cruelty, the neighbouring nations, and also such of their fellow-citizens as had embraced the gospel. To put a stop to this barbarous persecution, Christian princes exerted their zeal in a terrible manner, proclaiming capital punishment against all who persisted in the worship of the pagan deities. This dreadful severity contributed much more towards the extirpation of paganism, than the exhortations and instructions of ignorant missionaries, who were unacquainted with the true nature of the gospel, and dishonoured its pure and holy doctrines by their licentious lives, and their superstitious practices.

The Prussians, Lithuanians, Slavonians, Obotriti, and several other nations who dwelt in the lower parts of *Germany*, and lay still groveling in the darkness of paganism, continued to vex the Christians, who lived in their neighbourhood, by perpetual acts of hostility and violence, by frequent incursions into their territories, and by putting numbers of them to death in the most inhuman manner [k].

Spain and the Mahometans or Moors, see the Spanish histories of Jo. MARIANA and Jo. FERRERA.

[k] HELMOLDI *Chron. Slavorum*, lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 52.—ADAM: *Bremens. Histor.* lib. ii. cap. xxvii.

P A R T II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

CENT. XI. I. **T**HE declining condition of the Grecian empire was fatal to the progress of letters and philosophy. Its glory and power diminished from day to day under the insults and usurpations of the Turks and Saracens; and while the empire suffered by these attacks from without, it was consumed gradually by the internal pestilence of civil discord, by frequent seditions and conspiracies, and by those violent revolutions which shook from time to time the imperial throne, and were attended with the sudden fall and elevation of those that held the reins of government [a]. So many foreign invasions, so many internal troubles, so many emperors dethroned, deprived the political body of its strength and consistence, broke in upon the public order, rendered all things precarious, and dejecting the spirits of the nation, damped the fire of genius, and discouraged the efforts of literary ambition. There were, however, some emperors, such as ALEXIUS COMNENUS, who seemed to cherish and encourage the drooping sciences, and whose zeal was seconded by several prelates who were willing to lend a supporting hand to the cause of letters. The controversies also that subsisted between the Greeks and Latins, obliged the former, amidst all their disadvantages, to a certain degree of application to study, and prevented them from abandoning entirely the cul-

The state of
learning among the
Greeks.

[(a) The sentence which begins with the words *so many foreign*, and ends with the words *literary ambition*, is added by the translator to render the connexion with what follows more evident.

ture of the sciences. And hence it is, that we find a-
mong the Greeks of this century some writers, at least, who have deserved well of the republic of letters.

II. We pass in silence the poets, rhetoricians, and philologists of this century, who were neither highly eminent, nor absolutely contemptible. Among the writers of history LEO the *grammarian*, JOHN SCYLIZES, CEDRENUS, and a few others deserve to be mentioned with a certain degree of approbation; notwithstanding the partiality with which they are chargeable, and the zeal they discover for many of the fabulous records of their nation. But the greatest ornament of the republic of letters at this time, was MICHAEL PSELLUS, a man illustrious in every respect, and deeply versed in all the various kinds of erudition, that were known in this age. This great man recommended warmly to his countrymen the study of philosophy, and particularly the system of ARISTOTLE, which he embellished and illustrated in several learned and ingenious productions [b]. If we turn our eyes towards the Arabians, we shall find that they still retained a high degree of zeal for the culture of the sciences; as appears evidently from the number of physicians, mathematicians, and astronomers, who flourished among them in this century [c].

The principal Greek writers.

III. The arts and sciences seemed, in some measure, to revive in the west, among the clergy at least, and the monastic orders; they were not indeed cultivated by any other set of men, and the nobility, if we except such of them as were designed to fill certain ecclesiastical dignities, or had voluntarily devoted themselves to a religious solitude, treated all sorts of learning and erudition with indifference and contempt. The schools of learning flourished in several parts of *Italy* about the year 1050, and of the Italian doctors, who acquired a name by their writings or their academical lessons, several removed afterwards into *France*, and particularly into *Normandy*, where they instructed the youth, who

[b] LEO ALLATIUS *Diatriba de Psellis*, p. 14. edit. *Fabricii*.

[c] ELMACINI *Historia Saracen.* p. 281.—JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Historia Eccles. Sæc. xi.* p. 449.

CENT. XI. had consecrated themselves to the service of the church
 [d]. The French also, though they acknowledge their obligations to the learned Italians who settled in their provinces, yet give us, at the same time, a considerable list of their own countrymen, who, without any foreign succours, cultivated the sciences, and contributed not a little to the advancement of letters in this century; they mention also several schools erected in different parts of that kingdom, which were in the highest reputation, both on account of the fame of their masters, and the multitude of disciples that resorted to them [e]. And, indeed, it is certain beyond all contradiction, that the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated in *France*, which abounded with learned men, while the greatest part of *Italy* lay as yet covered with a thick cloud of ignorance and darkness. For ROBERT, king of *France*, son and successor of HUGH CAPET, disciple of the famous GERBERT, afterwards SILVESTER II, and the great protector of the sciences, and friend of the learned, reigned so early as the year 1031 [f], and exerted upon all occasions the most ardent zeal for the restoration of letters, nor were his generous efforts without success [g]. The provinces of *Sicily*, *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and other southern parts of *Italy* were indebted for the introduction of the sciences among them, to the Normans, who became their masters, and who brought with them from *France* the knowledge of letters to a people that sat benighted in the darkest ignorance. To the Normans also was due the restoration of letters in *England*. WILLIAM, the Conqueror, a prince of uncommon sagacity

[d] See MURATORI *Antiquitates Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 871.---GIANNONE *Histoire de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 148.

[e] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. vii. at the *Introduction*.---DU BOULAY *Hist. Academ. Paris*, tom. i. p. 355.---LE BEUF *Diff. sur l'Etat des Sciences en France depuis la mort du Roi Robert*, which is published among his *Dissertations sur l'Histoire Ecclesiastique et Civile de Paris*, tom. ii. part I.

[(f)] ROBERT died in the year 1031, after a reign of thirty-five years.]

[g] DANIEL *Histoire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 58.---DU BOULAY *Hist. Academ. Paris*, tom. i. p. 636, et *passim*.

and genius, and the great Mæcenæ of his time, upon CENT. XI. his accession to the throne of *England* in the year 1066, engaged, by the most alluring sollicitations, a considerable number of learned men from *Normandy*, and other countries, to settle in his new dominions, and exerted his most zealous endeavours to dispel that savage ignorance, that is always a source of innumerable evils [b]. The reception of Christianity had polished and civilized, in an extraordinary manner, the rugged minds of the valiant Normans; for those fierce warriors, who, under the darkness of paganism, had manifested the utmost aversion to all branches of knowledge and every kind of instruction, distinguished themselves, after their conversion, by their ardent application to the study of religion and the pursuit of learning.

IV. This vehement desire of knowledge that increased from day to day, and became, at length, the predominant passion of the politest European nations, produced many happy effects. To it, more particularly, we must attribute the considerable number of public schools that were opened in various places, and the choice of more able and eminent masters, than those, who had formerly presided in the seminaries of learning. Towards the conclusion of the preceding age, there were no schools in *Europe* but those which belonged to monasteries, or episcopal residence, nor were there any other masters, except the Benedictine monks, to instruct the youth in the principles of sacred and profane erudition. But not long after the commencement of this century the face of things was totally changed, and that in a manner the most advantageous to the cause of letters. In many cities of *France* and *Italy*, learned men both among the clergy and laity, undertook the weighty and important charge of instructing the youth, and succeeded much better in this worthy under-

Schools opened in several places.

[b] See *Hist. Littér. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 171.---The English, says MATTHEW PARIS, were so illiterate and ignorant before the time of WILLIAM the Conqueror, that a man, who understood the principles of grammar, was universally looked upon as a prodigy of learning.

CENT. XI. taking, than the monks had done, not only by comprehending in their course of instruction more branches of knowledge than the monastic doctors were acquainted with, but also by teaching in a better method and with more perspicuity and success, many of the same branches of science, which the others had taught before them. The most eminent of these new masters were such as had either traveled into *Spain* with a view to study in the schools of the Saracens (which was extremely customary in this age among those that were ambitious of a distinguished reputation for wisdom and knowledge) or had improved their stock of erudition and philosophy by a diligent and attentive perusal of the writings of the Arabians, of which a great number were translated into Latin. For with these foreign succours, they were enabled to teach philosophy, mathematics, physic, astronomy, and the other sciences that are connected with them, in a much more learned and solid manner, than the monks, or such, as had received their education from them alone. The school of *Salernum*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, was renowned above all others for the study of physic in this century, and vast numbers crowded thither from all the provinces of *Europe* to receive instruction in the art of healing: but the medical precepts which rendered the doctors of *Salernum* so famous, were all derived from the writings of the Arabians, or from the schools of the Saracens in *Spain* and *Africa* [i]. It was also from the schools and writings of the Arabian sages, that the absurd and puerile tricks of divination, and the custom of foretelling future events from the position of the stars, the features of the face, and the lines of the hand, derived their origin. These ridiculous practices proceeding from so respectable a source, and moreover adapted to satisfy the idle curiosity of impatient mortals, were carried on in all the Eu-

[i] MURATORI *Antiqu. Ital.* tom. iii. p. 935.---GIANNONE *Histoire de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 151.---FREIND'S *History of Physic*.---It is well known, that the famous precepts of the school of *Salernum*, for the preservation of health, were composed, in this century, at the request of the king of England.

European nations, and in process of time the pretended sciences of astrology and divination acquired the highest reputation and authority. CENT. XI.

V. The *seven liberal arts*, as they were now stiled, were taught in the greatest part of the schools, that were erected in this century for the education of youth. The first stage of these sciences was grammar, which was followed successively by rhetoric, and logic. When the disciple, having learned these three branches, which were generally known by the name of *trivium*, extended his ambition farther, and was desirous of new improvement in the sciences, he was conducted slowly through the *quadrivium* [k] to the very summit of literary fame. But this method of teaching, which had been received in all the western schools, was considerably changed towards the latter end of this century. For as the science of *logic*, under which *metaphysics* were in part comprehended, received new degrees of perfection from the deep meditations and the assiduous industry of certain acute thinkers, and was taught with more detail and subtilty than in former times, the greatest part of the studious youth became so enamoured of this branch of philosophy, as to abandon grammar, rhetoric, and all the other liberal arts that they might consecrate their whole time to the discussion of logical questions and the pursuit of metaphysical speculations. Nor was this surprising, when we consider, that, according to the opinion which now prevailed in the republic of letters, a man who was well versed in *dialectics*, i. e. in logical and metaphysical knowledge, was reputed sufficiently learned, and was supposed to stand in need of no other branches of erudition [l]. Hence that contempt of languages

P 3

[(k) The *trivium* was a term invented in the times of barbarism to express the three sciences that were first learned in the schools, viz. Grammar, rhetoric, and logic, and the schools, in which these sciences alone were taught, were called *triviales*. The *quadrivium* comprehended the four mathematical sciences, viz. Arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy.]

[l] BOULAY *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 408, 409. 511, 512.—This is too likely to become the prevailing taste even in our times; but it is

an

CENT XI. guages and eloquence, of the more elegant sciences, and the finer arts, which spread its baneful influence through the Latin provinces; and hence that barbarism and pedantic sophistry that dishonoured, in succeeding ages, the republic of letters, and corrupted, in a most hideous manner, the noble simplicity of true theology, and the purest systems of philosophical wisdom.

Dialectic or
logic in high
repute.

VI. The philosophy of the Latins, in this century, was absolutely confined within the circle of *dialectics*; while the other philosophical sciences, were scarcely known by name [m]. This *dialectic*, indeed, was not an ancient taste, as we may easily perceive by casting an eye upon the literary history of the xth century. And to confirm still farther the truth of that vulgar saying, that there is *nothing new under the sun*, we shall quote the following passage from the *Metalogicum* of JOHN of Salisbury, a writer of no mean abilities, Lib. i. Chap. ii. p. 741. edit. Lugdun. Bat. 1639. *Poetæ, Historiographi habebantur infames, et si quis incumbere laboribus antiquorum, notabatur ut non modo a fello Arcadiæ tardior, sed obtusior plumbo vel lapide, omnibus erat in risum. Suis enim, aut magistri sui, quisquis incumbere inventis—Fiebant ergo summi repente philosophi: nam qui illiteratus accefferat, fere non morabatur in scholis ulterius quam eo cuniculo temporis, quo avium pulli plumescunt.—Sed quid docebant novi doctores et qui plus somniorum, quam vigiliarum in scrutinio philosophiæ consumserant?—Ecce nova fiebant omnia: innovabatur grammatica, immutabatur dialectica, contemnebatur rhetorica, et novæ totius quadri-vii vias, evacuatis priorum regulis, de ipsius philosophiæ adytis proferebant. Solam convenientiam, sive rationem loquebantur, argumentum sonabat in ore omnium—ac ineptum nimis aut rude et a philosopho alienum, impossibile credebatur convenienter et ad rationis normam quicquam dicere aut facere, nisi convenientis et rationis mentio expressim erat inserta.* Many more passages of this nature are to be found in this author.

[m] We shall, indeed, find many in the records of this century, honoured with the title of *Philosophers*. Thus we hear of MANEGOLDUS the Philosopher, ADALARDUS the Philosopher, &c. But we must not attribute to the term *philosopher*, when applied to these grammarians, the sense which it bore among the ancient Greeks and Latins, and which it still bears in our times. In the style of, what we call, the middle age, every man of learning, of whatever kind his erudition might be, was called a *philosopher*, and this title was also given to the interpreters of scripture, though that set of men, were generally speaking, destitute of true philosophy. See the *Chronicon Salernitanum* in MURATORI *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. ii. part. II. cap. cxxiv. p. 265. where we are told, that in the xth century, in which the sciences were almost totally extinguished in Italy, there were xxxii philosophers at Benevento. We learn, however, by what follows, that these philosophers were partly grammarians, and partly persons, who were more or less versed in certain liberal arts.

serably

serably dry and barren; as long as it was drawn from no other source than the *ten categories* falsely attributed to St. AUGUSTIN, or from the explications of the Aristotelian philosophy composed by PORPHYRY and AVERROES. These, however, were the only guides which the schools had to follow in the beginning of this century, nor had the public teachers either genius or courage enough, to enlarge the system, or to improve upon the principles, of these dictators in philosophy, whose authority was treated as infallible, and their productions, for a long time, regarded as perfect, to the great detriment of true science. But about the year 1050, the face of philosophy began to change, and the science of logic assumed a new aspect. This revolution began in *France*, where several of the books of ARISTOTLE had been brought from the schools of the Saracens in *Spain*, and it was effected by a set of men highly renowned for their abilities, and genius, such as BERENGER, ROSCELLINUS, HILDEBERT, and after them by Gilbert de la Porre, the famous ABELARD, and others. These eminent logicians, though they followed the stagirite as their guide, took nevertheless the liberty to illustrate and model anew his philosophy, and to extend it far beyond its ancient limits.

VII. The philosophers of this age, who were most famous for their zealous and successful endeavours to improve the science of logic and accommodate it to general use, were LANFRANC, an Italian by birth, who was abbot of St. STEPHENS at *Caen*, in *Normandy*, and was called from thence by WILLIAM the Conqueror to the see of *Canterbury*, ANSELM his successor, and ODO, whose last promotion was the bishopric of *Cambray*. LANFRANC was so deeply versed in this science, that he was commonly called the *Dialectician*, and he employed with great dexterity the subtilties of logic in the controversy which was carried on between him and the learned BERENGER, against whom he maintained the real presence of CHRIST'S body and blood in the holy sacrament. ANSELM, in a very learned dialogue *De Grammatico*, throws much light upon the darkness and perplexity

CENT. XI. plexity in which the science of logic had lain so long involved; and among other things, investigates, with no small sagacity, the nature of *substance*, and *mode* or *quality*, in order to convey juster notions of these metaphysical entities than had been hitherto entertained [n]. This great prelate, who shone with a distinguished lustre in several branches of literature both sacred and profane, was the first of the Latin doctors who dispelled the clouds of ignorance and obscurity that hung over the important sciences of *metaphysic* and *natural theology*, as appears from two books of his composition, wherein the truths concerning the deity, which are deducible from the mere light of nature, are enumerated and explained with a degree of sagacity, which could not well be expected from a writer of this century. He was the inventor of that famous argument, vulgarly and erroneously attributed to DESCARTES, which demonstrates the existence of God from the idea of an infinitely perfect Being naturally implanted in the mind of man, and which is to be found, without exception, in the breast of every mortal. The solidity of this argument was, indeed, called in question, almost as soon as it was proposed, by GAUNILLO, a French monk, whose objections were answered by ANSELM, in a treatise professedly written for that purpose [o]. Odo, the third restorer

[n] This dialogue is to be found in the works of ANSELM, published by father GERBERON, tom. i. p. 143.

[o] GAUNILLO's Treatise is to be found in the works of ANSELM, with the answer of that learned prelate. [As ANSELM makes such a shining fire in the literary history of *England*, it will not be improper to add here a more ample account of his character and writings than that which is given by Dr. MOSHEIM. His life and manners were without reproach, though his spiritual ambition exposed him justly to censure. His works are divided into three parts. The first contains his dogmatical tracts, and begins with a discourse concerning the *Existence of God*, the *Divine Attributes*, and the *Trinity*. This discourse is called *Monologia*, because it is drawn up in the form of a soliloquy. In this first part of the works of ANSELM, there are many curious researches upon subjects of a very difficult and mysterious nature, such as the *Fall of Satan*, the *Reason why God created Man*, the doctrine of *Original Sin*, and the *Manner of its Communication to ADAM's Posterity*, the *Liberty of the Will*, and

restorer of logic whom we mentioned above, taught CENT. XI. that science with the greatest applause, and illustrated it in three learned productions, which have not survived the ruins of time [p].

VIII. The restoration of logic was immediately followed by a vehement dispute between its restorers and patrons, concerning the *object* of that science; such was the term employed by the contending parties. This controversy, which was long agitated in the schools, was in its nature extremely trivial and unimportant, but considered in its consequences it became a very serious and weighty affair, since the disputants on both sides made use of their respective opinions in explaining the doctrines of religion, and reciprocally loaded each other with the most odious invectives and the most opprobrious accusations. In one point only they were unanimous, acknowledging that *logic* or *dialectic* had for its essential *object* the consideration of *universals* in their various relations and points of comparison, since *particular* and individual things, being liable to change, could not be the objects of a sure and immutable science. But the great question was, whether these *universals*, which came within the sphere of logical inquiries, belonged to the class of real *things*, or to that of mere *denominations*? One set of these subtle disputants maintained, that *universals* were undoubted *realities* and supported their hypothesis by the authority of PLATO, BOETIUS, and other ancient sages; the other affirmed, that they were mere *words*, and outward denominations, and pleaded in behalf of their cause the re-

Disputes
among the
logicians.

Nominalists
and Realists.

and the *Consistency of Freedom with the Divine Prescience*. The second and third parts of the writings of this eminent prelate contain his practical and devotional performances, such as *Homilies*, *Poems*, *Prayers*, &c. and his *Letters*, which are divided into four books]

[p] The titles of these three treatises, are as follow: *De Sophista*, *De Complexionibus*, *De re et Ente*. The learned HERIMAN, in his *Narratio restorationis Abbatiae Sti. Martini Tornacensis*, which is published in DAHERIUS'S *Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter.* tom. ii. p. 889. speaks of ODO in the following honourable manner: *Cum Odo septem liberalium artium esset peritus, præcipue tamen in dialectica eminebat, et pro ipsa maxime clericorum frequentia eum expetebat.*

spectable

CENT. XI. Spectable suffrages of ARISTOTLE and PORPHYRY. The former were called Realists on account of their doctrine, and the latter Nominalists for the same reason. Each of the contending parties were, in process of time, subdivided into various sects, on account of the different ways in which many explained the doctrine, that was the badge and characteristic of their sect [q]. This controversy made a prodigious noise in all the schools throughout *Europe* during many succeeding ages, and produced often unhappy contentions and animosities between philosophers and divines. Some are of opinion, that it derived its origin from the disputes, that were carried on between BERENGER, and his adversaries, concerning the eucharist [r]; a notion which, though it be advanced without authority, is yet, by no means, destitute of probability, since the hypothesis of the Nominalists might be very successfully employed in defending the doctrine of BERENGER, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

IX. The sect of the Nominalists had for their chief a certain person called JOHN, who, on account of his logical subtilty was surnamed the *Sophist*, which is the only circumstance we know of his history [s]. His principal

[q] The learned BRUCKER, in his *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, tom. iii. p. 904. gives an ample account of the sect of the Nominalists, and enlarges a good deal upon the nature and circumstances of this logical contest; he also mentions the various writers, who have made this sect and its doctrine the object of their researches. Among these writers, the principal was JOHN SALABERT, presbyter in the diocese of *Agen*, who published at *Paris*, in the year 1651, in 8vo. a treatise entitled, *Philosophia Nominalium Vindicata*. This book, which is extremely rare, has been seen by none of the authors who have written professedly concerning the sect of the Nominalists. A copy of it, taken from a manuscript in the French king's library, was communicated to me, from which it appears, that SALABERT, who was certainly a very acute and ingenious logician, employed his labour rather in defending the doctrine of the Nominalists, than in giving an accurate account of their sect. There are, however, several things to be found in his book, which are far from being generally known, even among the learned.

[r] DU BOULAY *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 443.—GERH. DU BOIS *Histor. Ecclesiæ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 770.

[s] This account we have from the unknown author of the *Fragmen-*
tum

principal disciples were ROBERT of *Paris*, ROSCELIN of *Compiegne*, and ARNOUL of *Laon*, who propagated his doctrine with industry and success, to whom we may add, with some probability, RAIMBERT, the master of a famous school at *Lisle* in *Flanders*, who is said according to the quibbling humour of the times, to *have read* NOMINAL logic to his disciples, while ODO, whom we have already had occasion to mention, *instructed his scholars in* REALITY [t]. Be that as it may, the most renowned of all the *nominal* philosophers of this age was ROSCELIN; and hence it is that many have considered him as the chief and founder of that sect, and that he is still considered as such by several learned men.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

I. ALL the records of this century loudly complain of the vices that reigned among the rulers of the church, and, in general, among all the sacerdotal orders; they also deplore that universal decay of piety

The corruption of the clergy.

tum Historiæ Franciæ a Roberto rege ad mortem Philippi I, which is published in DU CHESNE's *Scriptores Historiæ Franciæ*, tom. iv. p. 90. whose words are as follows: *In Dialectica hi potentes extiterunt Sophistæ, Johannes, qui artem Sophisticam vocalem esse differuit*, &c.—DU BOULAY (*Histor. Academ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 443 et 612.) conjectures, that this JOHN the Sophist was the same person with JOHN of *Chartres*, surnamed the *Deaf*, who was first physician to HENRY I, king of *France*, and had acquired a high degree of renown by his genius and erudition. The same author (p. 377.) tells us, that JOHN had for his master, GIRALDUS of *Orleans*, who was an incomparable poet and excellent rhetorician, but he advances this without any proof. MABILLON, on the other hand, in his *Annal. Benedic.* tom. v. lib. lxxvii. § lxxviii. p. 261. supposes, that JOHN the Nominalist was the same person, who made known to ANSELM the error of ROSCELINUS concerning the three persons in the Godhead.

[t] The passage in the original is: *Qui dialecticam clericis suis in voce legebat, quum ODO in RE discipulis legeret*. See HERIMANNUS *Histor. restaurationis Monasterii Sti. Martini Tornacens.* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 889.

and

CENT. XI.

and discipline, that was the consequence of this corruption in a set of men, who were bound to support by their example, their authority, and their instructions, the sacred interests of religion and virtue. The western bishops, were no sooner elevated to the rank of dukes, counts, and nobles, and enriched with ample territories, than they gave themselves up entirely to the dominion of pleasure and ambition, and, wholly employed in displaying the magnificence of their temporal stations, frequented the courts of princes accompanied always with a splendid train of attendants and domestics [u]. The inferior orders of the clergy were also licentious in their own way; few among them preserved any remains of piety and virtue, we might add, of decency and discretion. While their rulers were wallowing in luxury, and basking in the beams of worldly pomp and splendor, they were indulging themselves, without the least sense of shame, in fraudulent practices, in impure and lascivious gratifications, and even in the commission of the most flagitious crimes. The Grecian clergy were somewhat less chargeable with these shocking irregularities, as the calamities under which their country groaned imposed a restraint upon their passions, and gave a check to their licentiousness. Yet, notwithstanding these salutary restraints, there were few examples of piety and virtue to be found among them.

The authority of the Roman pontiffs.

II. The authority and lustre of the Latin church, or to speak more properly, the power and dominion of the Roman pontiffs, arose in this century to their highest period, though they arose by degrees, and had much opposition and many difficulties to conquer. In the preceding age the pontiffs had acquired a great degree of authority in religious matters, and in every thing that related to the government of the church, and

[u] See among other examples of this episcopal grandeur, that of ADALBERT, in ADAM. *Bremens.* lib. iii. cap. xxiii. p. 38. lib. iv. cap. xxxv. p. 52. that of GUNTHER, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of CANISIUS, tom. iii. part. I. p. 185. and that of MANASSES, in the *Museum Italicum* of MABILLON, tom. i. p. 114. Add to all these MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 72.

their

their credit and influence increased prodigiously towards the commencement of this century. For then they received the pompous titles of *masters of the world*, and *popes*, i. e. *universal fathers*; they presided also every where in the councils by their legates; assumed the authority of supreme arbiters in all controversies that arose concerning religion or church discipline; and maintained the pretended rights of the church against the encroachments and usurpations of kings and princes. Their authority, however, was confined within certain limits; for on the one hand, it was restrained by sovereign princes, that it might not arrogantly aim at civil dominion; and on the other, it was opposed by the bishops themselves, that it might not arise to a spiritual despotism, and utterly destroy the liberty and privileges of synods and councils [w]. From the time of LEO IX, the popes employed every method, which the most artful ambition could suggest, to remove these limits, and to render their dominion both despotic and universal. They not only aspired to the character of supreme legislators in the church, to an unlimited jurisdiction over all synods and councils whether general or provincial, to the sole distribution of all ecclesiastical honours and benefices as divinely authorised and appointed for that purpose, but they carried their insolent pretensions so far as to give themselves out for lords of the universe, arbiters of the fate of kingdoms and empires, and supreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before LEO IX, no pope was so enormously impudent as to claim this unbounded authority, or to assume the power of transferring territories and provinces from their lawful possessors to new masters. This pontiff gave the example of such an amazing pretension to his *holy* successors, by granting to the Normans, who

[w] The very learned LAUNOY (in his *Afferta contra Privilegium Sti. Medardi*, part. II. cap. xxxi. Opp. tom. iii. part. II. p. 307.) has given us an accurate account of the ecclesiastical laws, and of the power of the hierarchy, during this century, which he collected from the letters of pope GREGORY VII; from which account it appears, that GREGORY, ambitious as he was, did not pretend to a supreme and despotic authority in the church.

CENT. XI. had settled in *Italy*, the lands and territories which they had already usurped, or were employed in forcing out of the hands of the Greeks and Saracens [x]. The ambition, however, of the aspiring popes was opposed by the emperors, the kings of *France*, by WILLIAM the Conqueror, who was now seated on the throne of *England*, and was the boldest assertor of the rights and privileges of royalty against the impudent claims of the apostolic see [y], and also by several other princes. Nor did the bishops, particularly those of *France* and *Germany*, sit tamely silent under the papal yoke; many of them endeavoured to maintain their rights, and the privileges of the church; but as many, seduced by the allurements of interest or the dictates of superstition, sacrificed their liberties, and yielded to the pontiffs. Hence it happened, that these imperious lords of the church, though they did not entirely gain their point, nor satisfy to the full their raging ambition, yet obtained vast augmentations of power, and extended their authority from day to day.

[x] See GUAFR. MALATERRA *Hist. Sicula*, lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 553. tom. v. *Scriptor. Ital.* MURATORII. [The translator has here incorporated the note [s] of the original into the text.]

[y] See EADMERI *Historia novorum*, lib. i. p. 29. which is published at the end of the works of ANSELM, archbishop of *Canterbury*. It is proper to observe here, that if it is true on the one hand, that WILLIAM the Conqueror opposed, on many occasions, with the utmost vehemence and zeal the growing power of the Roman pontiffs, and of the aspiring bishops; it is no less certain, on the other, that, to accomplish his ambitious views, he, like many other European princes, had recourse to the influence of the pontiffs upon the minds of the multitude, and thereby nourished and encouraged the pride and ambition of the court of *Rome*. For while he was preparing all things for his expedition into *England*, he sent ambassadors to pope ALEXANDER II, in order (as MATTHEW PARIS says, *Hist. Major*, lib. i. p. 2.) to have his undertaking approved and justified by apostolical authority; and the pope, having considered the claims of the contending parties, sent a STANDARD to WILLIAM as the omen of his approaching royalty. It is highly probable, that the Normans in *Italy* had made the same humble request to LEO IX, and demanded his confirmation both of the possessions they had acquired, and of those they designed to usurp. And when we consider all this, it will not appear so surprizing that the popes aimed at universal empire, since they were encouraged to this by the mean submissions and servile homage of the European princes.

III. The see of *Rome*, after the death of SILVESTER CENT. XI.
II, which happened in the year 1003, was filled successively by JOHN XVII, JOHN XVIII, and SERGIUS IV, none of whose pontificates were distinguished by any memorable events; it is, however proper to observe, that these three popes were confirmed in the see of *Rome* by the approbation and authority of the emperors, under whose reign they were elected to that high dignity. BENEDICT VIII, who was raised to the pontificate in the year 1012, being obliged by his competitor GREGORY to leave *Rome*, fled into *Germany* for succour, and threw himself at the feet of HENRY II, by whom he was reinstated in the Apostolic chair, which he possessed in peace until the year 1024. It was during his pontificate, that those famous Normans, who make such a shining figure in history, came into *Italy*, and reduced several of its richest provinces under their dominion. BENEDICT was succeeded by his brother JOHN XIX, who ruled the church until the year 1033. The five pontiffs we have now been mentioning were not chargeable with dishonouring their high station by that licentiousness and immorality that rendered so many of their successors infamous; their lives were virtuous, at least, their conduct was decent. But their examples had little effect upon BENEDICT IX, a most abandoned profligate, and a wretch capable of the most horrid crimes, whose flagitious conduct drew upon him the just resentment of the Romans, who, in the year 1038, degraded him from his office. He was afterwards indeed restored, by the emperor CONRAD, to the papal chair; but instead of learning circumspection and prudence from his former disgrace, he grew still more scandalous in his life and manners, and so provoked the Roman people by his repeated crimes, that they deposed him a second time A. D. 1044, and elected in his place JOHN bishop of *Sabina*, who assumed the name of SYLVESTER III. About three months after this new revolution, the relations and adherents of BENEDICT rose up in arms, drove SYLVESTER out of the city, and restored the degraded pontiff to his forfeited honours,

CENT. XI. honours, which, however, he did not enjoy long; for, perceiving that there was no possibility of appeasing the resentment of the Romans, he sold the pontificate to JOHN GRATIAN, arch-presbyter of *Rome*, who took the name of GREGORY VI. Thus the church had, at the same time, two chiefs, SYLVESTER and GREGORY, whose rivalry was the occasion of much trouble and confusion. This contest was terminated in the year 1046, in the council held at *Sutri* by the emperor HENRY III, who so ordered matters, that BENEDICT, GREGORY, and SYLVESTER were declared unworthy of the pontificate, and SUIDGER, bishop of *Bamberg*, was raised to that dignity, which he enjoyed for a short time under the title of CLEMENT II. [z].

IV. After the death of CLEMENT II, which happened in the year 1047, BENEDICT IX, though twice degraded, aimed anew at the papal dignity, and accordingly forced himself into St. PETER's chair for the third time. But the year following he was obliged to surrender the pontificate to POPPO, bishop of *Brixen*, known by the name of DAMASUS II, whom HENRY II elected pope in *Germany*, and sent from thence into *Italy* to take possession of that dignity. Upon the death of DAMASUS, who ruled the see of *Rome* but three and twenty days, the same emperor, in the diet held at *Worms* A. D. 1048, appointed BRUNO, bishop of *Toul*, to succeed him in the pontificate. This prelate is known in the list of the popes by the name of LEO IX, and his private virtues, as well as his public acts of zeal and piety in the government of the church, were deemed meritorious enough to entitle him to a place among the saintly order. But if we deduce from these pretended virtues his vehement zeal for augmenting the opulence and authority of the church of *Rome*, and his laudable severity in correcting and punishing certain

[z] In this compendious account of the popes, I have followed the relations of FRANCIS and ANTHONY PAGI, PAPEBROCK, and also those of MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiæ*, persuaded that the learned and judicious reader will justify my treating with the utmost contempt, what BARONIUS and others have alledged in favour of GREGORY VI.

enormous,

enormous vices [a], which were common among the clergy during his pontificate, there will remain little in the life and administration of this pontiff, that could give him any pretension to such high distinction. It is, at least, certain, that many who industriously conceal or excuse the numerous infirmities and failings of the pontiff's, censure, with the utmost freedom, the temerity and injustice of the measures he took towards the conclusion of his days. Such, among others, was the war which he inconsiderately entered into, in the year 1053, with the Normans, whose neighbourhood he did not like; and whom he was grieved to see in the possession of *Apulia*. His temerity, indeed, was severely punished by the issue of this war, from which he derived the bitterest fruits, being taken prisoner by the enemy, and led captive to *Benevento*. Here dismal reflexions upon his unhappy fate preyed upon his spirits, and threw him into a dangerous fit of sickness; so that after a year's imprisonment he was sent to *Rome*, where he concluded his days on the 19th of *April*, A. D. 1054 [b].

V. After the death of LEO the papal chair was filled, in the year 1055, by GEBHARD, bishop of *Eichstadt*, who assumed the name VICTOR II; and, after governing the church about three years, was succeeded by STEPHEN IX, brother to GODFREY, duke of *Lorrain*, who died a few months after his election. Nothing memorable happened under the administration of these two pontiffs. GERRARD, bishop of *Florence*, who obtained the papacy A. D. 1058, and took the name of NICOLAS II, makes a greater figure in history than several

[(a) In several councils, which he assembled in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, he proposed rigorous laws against simony, sodomy, incestuous, and adulterous marriages; the custom of carrying arms that was grown universal among the clergy; the apostasy of the monks, who abandoned their habit and renounced their profession, &c.]

[b] See the *Acta Sanctorum ad d. xix. Aprilis*, tom. iii. p. 642.—*Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 459.—GIANNONE *Hist. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 52.

CENT. XI. ral of his predecessors [c]. We pass in silence, JOHN, bishop of *Veletri*, who usurped the pontificate, as also the title of BENEDICT X, after the death of STEPHEN, and who was deposed with ignominy, after having possessed about nine months the dignity, to which he had no other title, than what he derived from lawless violence. NICOLAS, upon the removal of this usurper, assembled a council at *Rome* A. D. 1059, in which, among many salutary laws designed to heal the inveterate disorders that had afflicted the church, one remarkable decree was passed for changing the ancient form of electing the Roman pontiff; this alteration was designed to prevent the tumults and commotions which arose in *Rome*, and the factions which divided *Italy*, when a new pope was to be elected. The same pontiff received the homage of the Normans, and solemnly created ROBERT GUISSARD, duke of *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and *Sicily*, on condition that he should observe, as a faithful vassal, an inviolable allegiance to the Roman church, and pay an annual tribute in acknowledgment of his subjection to the apostolic see. By what authority NICOLAS confirmed the Norman prince in the possession of these provinces, is more than we know; certain it is, that he had no sort of property in the lands which he granted so liberally to the Normans, who held them already by the odious right of conquest [d]. Perhaps the lordly pontiff founded this right of cession, upon the fictitious donation of CONSTANTINE, which has been already taken notice of in the course of this history; or, probably, seduced by the artful and ambitious suggestions of HILDEBRAND, who had himself an eye upon the pontificate, and afterwards filled it, in effect, under the adopted name of GREGORY VII, he imagined that, as CHRIST'S vicegerent, the Roman pontiff was the king of kings,

[c] Besides the accounts given of NICOLAS II, by the writers of the papal history, there is a particular and accurate history of this pontiff drawn up by the Benedictine monks, in the *Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 515.

[d] See MURATORI *Annali d'Italia*, tom. v. p. 186.—BARONIUS *Annal ad A.* 1060.

and had the whole universe for his domain. It is well known that HILDEBRAND, had a supreme ascendant in the councils of NICOLAS, and that the latter neither undertook nor executed any thing without his direction. Be that as it may, it was the feudal grant made to GUISCARD by this pope, that laid the foundation of the kingdom of *Naples*, or of the two *Sicilies*, and of the sovereignty over that kingdom which the Roman pontiffs constantly claim, and which the Sicilian monarchs annually acknowledge.

VI. Before the pontificate of NICOLAS II, the popes were chosen not only by the suffrages of the *cardinals*, but also by those of the whole Roman clergy, the nobility, the burgesses, and the assembly of the people. An election, in which such a confused and jarring multitude was concerned, could not but produce continual factions, animosities, and tumults. To prevent these, as far as was possible, this artful and provident pontiff had a law passed, by which the *cardinals*, as well presbyters, as bishops, were empowered, upon a vacancy in the see of *Rome*, to elect a new pope, without any prejudice to the ancient privileges of the Roman emperors in this important matter [e]. Nor were the rest of the clergy,

The privileges of the cardinals in the election of the popes.

with

[(e) It does not appear that NICOLAS was at all solicitous about the privileges of the emperor, and his authority in the election of the bishop of *Rome*; for the words of the decree in all the various copies of it are to this import: "The cardinals shall first deliberate concerning the election of a pontiff, and the consent of the other clergy and of the people shall be required to confirm their choice. The pope shall be chosen out of the members that compose the church of *Rome*, if a proper person can be found among them; if not, he shall be elected elsewhere. *All this without any prejudice to the honour of our dear son HENRY (who is now king, and shall be soon emperor, as we have already promised him) or to the honour of his successors on whom the apostolic see shall confer personally and successively the same high privilege.*" Here we see the good pontiff taking manifestly advantage of the minority of HENRY IV, to depreciate and diminish the ancient prerogatives of the imperial crown, and to magnify the authority of the papal mitre; for he declares as a *personal right* granted by the Roman see to each emperor for himself, the privilege of confirming the pope's election, whereas it is well known that that privilege had been vested in the emperors of *Germany* during many preceding ages. See FLEURY *Eccles. Hist.* vol. xiii. livre ix. p. 64, 65. *Brussels edition.*—It is proper to ob-

serve

CENT. IX. with the burgesſes and people, excluded from all in this election, ſince their conſent was ſolemnly demanded, and alſo eſteemed of much weight [f]. In conſequence, however of this new regulation, the *cardinals* acted the principal part in the creation of the new pontiff, though they ſuffered for a long time much oppoſition both from the ſacerdotal orders and the Roman citizens, who were conſtantly either reclaiming their ancient rights, or abuſing the privilege they yet retained of confirming the election of every new pope by their approbation and conſent. In the following century there was an end put to all theſe diſputes by ALEXANDER III, who was ſo lucky as to finiſh and complete what NICOLAS had only begun, and who transferred and confined to the college of *cardinals* the right of electing to the apoſtolic ſee, excluding the nobility, the people, and the reſt of the clergy from all concern in this important matter [g].

It ſerve here, that the cringing and ignoble ſubmiſſion of CHARLES the Bald, who would not accept of the title of emperor before it was conferred upon him by the Roman pontiff, occaſioned, in proceſs of time, that abſurd notion that the papal conſecration was requiſite in order to qualify the kings of *Germany* to aſſume the title of Roman emperors, though, without that conſecration, theſe kings had all *Italy* under their dominion, and exerciſed in every part of it the various rights and prerogatives of ſovereignty. Hence the kings of *Germany* were firſt ſtiled kings of the Franks and Lombards, afterwards kings of the Romans until the year 1508, when MAXIMILIAN I. changed the title of *king* into that of *emperor*.]

[f] The decree of NICOLAS concerning the election of the Roman pontiff is to be found in many authors, and particularly in the *Concilia*. But upon comparing together ſeveral copies of this famous decree, I found them in many reſpects very different from each other. In ſome copies the decree appears abridged; in others, it is long and prolix. In ſome it ſeems favourable to the rights and privileges of the Roman emperors; in others, it appears to have the contrary tendency. The moſt ample copy is that which we find in the *Chronicon Farſenſe* in MURATORI'S *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. ii. part. II. p. 645. which differs however, in various circumſtances, from that which is publiſhed by HUGO FLORIANENSIS, in his book *De regia poteſtate et ſacerdotali dignitate*, in BALUZII *Miſcellaneis*, tom. iv. p. 62. Notwithſtanding the diverſity that there is in the copies of this famous decree, they all agree in confirming the accounts we have given of the plans and pontificate of NICOLAS.

[g] See MABILLON, *Comm. in Ord. Roman*, tom. ii. *Muſei Italici*, p.

It may not be improper here to give some account of CENT. XI.
the origin of the *cardinals* [b], and the nature of their
privileges and functions. Many writers [i] have treated
this subject in an ample manner, and have shed upon
it a profusion of erudition, which deserves, no doubt,
the highest applause; but they are, generally speaking,
defective in perspicuity and precision; nor do I know of
any, who have confined themselves to the true state of
the question, and investigated, in a satisfactory manner
the true origin of the office of cardinal, and the reasons
that occasioned the institution of that order of ecclesia-
stics. Several learned men have employed much time
and labour in fixing the sense of the word *cardinal*, and
in illustrating its meaning from ancient monuments
and records; but, however worthy of a curious philolo-
gist these researches may be, yet they contribute little
or nothing to clear up the point in question, or to con-
vey an accurate and satisfactory notion of the true ori-
gin of the college of cardinals, and the nature of that
ecclesiastical dignity. It is certain, that the word *car-*
dinal, when applied to persons or things, or more espe-
cially to the sacred order, was, according to the lan-
guage of the middle age, a term of dubious significati-
on, and was susceptible of various senses. It is also well
known, that in former times this title was, by no
means, peculiar to the priests and ministers of the church
of *Rome*, but was in use in all the latin churches, and

114.—CONSTANT. CENNI *Præf. ad Concilium Lateran. Stephani iii.* p.
18. *Rom.* 1735, in 4to.—FRANC. PAGI *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.*
tom. ii. p. 374.

[(b) The translator has here incorporated into the text the long and
important note [c] of the original, concerning the *cardinals*. The cita-
tions and references only are thrown into the notes.]

[i] The authors who have written concerning the name, origin, and
rights of the *cardinals*, are enumerated by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his
Bibliogr. Antiquar. p. 455, 456.—CASP. SAGGITTARIUS *Introd. ad*
Historiam Ecclesiast. cap. xxix. p. 771. et JÖ. ANDR. SCAMIDIUS in
Supplement. p. 644.—CHRIST. GRYPHIUS *Isagoge ad Historiam Sæculi*
xvii. p. 430 add to these LUDOV. THOMASSINI *Disciplinæ Ecclesiæ*
vetus et nova, tom. i. lib. ii. cap. 115, 116. p. 616. & LUD. ANT.
MURATORI, whose learned dissertation *De origine cardinalatus* is pub-
lished in his *Antiquit. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 156.

CENT. XI. that not only the *secular* clergy, but also the *regular*, such as abbots, canons, and monks, were capable of this nomination, and were stiled *cardinals*, though in different senses. But after the pontificate of ALEXANDER III, the common use of the term *cardinal* was gradually diminished, and it was confined to such only as were immediately concerned in the election of the pope, and who had the right of suffrage in this weighty matter. So that when we inquire into the origin of the college of *cardinals* at Rome, the question is not, who they were, that in the remoter periods of the church were distinguished, among the Latins in general, or at Rome in particular, from the rest of the clergy, by the name of *cardinals*; nor do we inquire into the proper signification of that term, or into the various senses in which it was formerly employed; the true state of the question is this: Who the persons were that NICOLAS II comprehended under the denomination of *cardinals*, when he vested in the Roman *cardinals* alone the right of electing the new pontiff, and excluded from that important privilege the rest of the clergy, the nobility, the burgesses and the people? When this is known with certainty, then we shall have a just notion of the college of *cardinals* in its first rise, and shall also perceive the difference there is between the first *cardinals*, and those of our times. Now this may easily be learned from the edict of NICOLAS II, which sets the matter in the clearest light. *We have thought proper to enact*, says the pontiff, *that upon the decease of the bishop of the Roman catholic or universal church, the affair of the election be treated principally and previously to all other deliberations, among the CARDINAL BISHOPS alone, who afterwards shall call in to their council the CARDINAL CLERKS, and require finally the consent of the rest of the clergy and the people to their election* [k]. Here we see, that the pontiff divides

[(k)] The passage of the edict (which we have here translated from HUGO FLORIANUS in BALUZI *Miscell.* tom. iv. p. 62.) runs thus in the original: *Constituimus ut, obitu hujus Romanæ universalis Ecclesiæ Pontificis, imprimis CARDINALES EPISCOPI diligentissima simul considera-*
tione

vides into two classes the *cardinals* who were to have the right of suffrage in the election of his successors, one of which he calls *cardinal bishops*, and the other *cardinal clerks*. By the former we are manifestly to understand the seven bishops, who belong to the city and territory of *Rome*, whom *NICOLAS* calls, in the same edict, *comprovinciales episcopi* (an epithet which had been used before by *LEO I*) and who had been distinguished by the title of *cardinal bishops* long before the present century. The words of *NICOLAS* confirm this account of the matter, and place it beyond all possibility of contradiction; for he declares, that by *cardinal bishops* he understands those to whom it belonged to consecrate the pontiff elect; *since the apostolic see*, observes the papal legislator, *cannot be under the jurisdiction of any superior or metropolitan* [l], *the CARDINAL BISHOPS must necessarily supply the place of a metropolitan, and fix the elected pontiff on the summit of apostolic exaltation and empire* [m]. Now it is well known, that the seven bishops of *Rome*, abovementioned, had the privilege of consecrating the Roman pontiff.

All these things being duly considered, we shall immediately perceive the true nature and meaning of the famous edict, according to which it is manifest, that, upon the death of a pontiff, the *CARDINAL BISHOPS* were first to deliberate *alone* concerning a proper successor, and to examine the respective merit of the candidates that might pretend to this dignity, and afterwards to call in the *CARDINAL CLERKS*, not only to demand their counsel, but also to join with them in the election. The word *clerk* here bears the same sense with that of

tione tractantes, mox sibi CLERICOS CARDINALES adhibeant, sicque reliquis Clerus et Populus ad censuram electionis accedant.]

[(l) In the consecration of a new bishop in any province the metropolitan always bore the principal part; as therefore there was no metropolitan to install the pope, the *CARDINAL BISHOPS* performed that ceremony.]

[m] Such are the swelling and bombastic terms of the edict. *Quia sedes apostolica super se metropolitanum habere non potest; cardinales episcopi metropolitani vice procubio fungantur, qui electum antistitem ad apostolici culminis apicem provehant.*

CENT. XI. *presbyter*; and it is undeniably certain, that the name of *cardinal presbyters* was given to the ministers of the eight and twenty Roman *parishes*, or principal churches. All the rest of the clergy, of whatever order or rank they might be, were, together with the people, expressly excluded from the right of voting in the election of the pontiff, though they were allowed what is called a *negative suffrage*, and their consent was required to what the others had done. From all which it appears, that the college of electors, who chose the Roman pontiff, and who after this period were called *cardinals* in a new and unusual acceptation of that term, consisted, according to their original establishment by NICOLAS II, of only two orders, namely *cardinal bishops* and *cardinal clerks*, or *presbyters* [n].

It is necessary to observe, before we finish this digression, that the famous decree of NICOLAS could not obtain the force of a law. “It is evident, says ANSELM, *bishop of Lucca* [o], that the edict of NICOLAS is, and always has been, without the smallest degree of weight or authority. But in affirming this, I have not the least design to cast any reflexion upon the blessed memory of that pontiff, or to derogate from

[n] We must therefore take care that we be not misled by the error of ONUPHR. PANVINIUS, who affirms, * that the *cardinal bishops* were not added to the college of cardinals before the pontificate of ALEXANDER III. Nor are we to listen to the supposition of those writers, who imagine that certain *deacons* were, from the beginning, members of that college of *cardinals*, by whom the popes were elected. There were, indeed, in the Roman church, long before the edict of NICOLAS, and there still remain *cardinal deacons*, i. e. superintendents of those churches which have hospitals annexed to them, and whose revenues are appropriated to the support of the poor; but they were evidently excluded from the election of the pope, which, by the edict of NICOLAS, was to be made by the *cardinal bishops and clerks* alone. Hence we find the *cardinals* plainly distinguished from the *deacons* in the diploma that was drawn up for the election of GREGORY VII to the pontificate.

[o] ANSELM *Luccensis* lib. ii. *contra WIBERTUM Antipapam, et sequaces ejus*, in CANISII *Lectionib. Antiquis*, tom. iii. part. I. p. 383.

* See MABILLON, *Comment in Ordinem Rom.* p. 115. tom. ii. *Musei Italici*.

“ the

“ the applause that is due to his virtues as CENT. XI.

“ a man, however, he was fallible, and, through the
 “ weakness that is inseparable from humanity, was lia-
 “ ble to be seduced into measures that were inconsistent
 “ with equity and justice.” It is true, the prelate has
 here principally in view that part of the edict in which
 NICOLAS acknowledges and confirms the right of the
 emperors to ratify the election of the Roman pontiff;
 yet what he says is undoubtedly true of the whole e-
 dict in all its parts. For the seven *palatine judges* [p],
 who were excluded by this decree from the important
 privilege they had formerly enjoyed of voting in the
 election to the apostolic see, complained loudly of the
 injury that was done them, and, seconded in their com-
 plaints by the various orders of the clergy, and by the
 clamours of the army, the citizens, and the multitude,
 they declared their opposition to the execution of this
 edict, and gave much trouble and uneasiness to the *car-*
dinals who had been constituted electors by NICOLAS.
 To appease these tumults, ALEXANDER III augmented
 the college of the electing *cardinals*, by conferring that
 dignity upon the prior, or arch-priester of *St. John*
Lateran, the arch-priesters of *St. Peter's* and *St. Mary*
Maggiore, the abbots of *St. Paul's* and *St. Laurence with-*
out the wall, and, lastly, upon the seven *Palatine judg-*
es [q]. By this dexterous stratagem the higher order
 of the clergy was defeated, and ceased to oppose the
 measures of the *cardinal* electors; nor, indeed, could
 their opposition be of any significance, since their chiefs
 and leaders were become members of the sacred col-
 lege instituted by NICOLAS. The *inferior clergy* conti-
 nued yet obstinate, but their opposition was vanquished
 in the same manner, and they were reduced to silence by
 the promotion of their chiefs, the *cardinal deacons*, to the

[p] These judges were the *Primicerius, Secundicerius, Arcarius, Sac-*
cellarius, Protoſcriniarius, Primicerius, Defensorum, et adminiculator; for
 a particular account of whose respective offices, services, and privileges,
 see GRÆVII *Tbeſaurus Antiquit.* DU CANGE, &c.

[q] CENNI *Præf. ad Concil. Lateran. Stephan. iii.* p. 19.—MABIL-
 LON, *Comment. ad Ord. Roman.* p. 115. *ex Panvinio.*

CENT. XI. dignity of electors. Who it was, whether ALEXANDER III, or some other pontiff, that raised the principal Roman deacons to the rank of *cardinals*, is not certain; but nothing more evident than that the design of this promotion was to put an end to the murmurs and complaints of the inferior clergy, who resented highly the violation of their privileges.

When the various orders of the clergy were drawn off from the opposition, it was no difficult matter to silence the people, and to exclude them from all part in the election of the pontiff. And accordingly, when, upon the death of ALEXANDER III, it was proposed to choose LUCIUS III [r] as his successor, the consent and approbation of the clergy and people, which had hitherto been always esteemed necessary to ratify the election, were not so much as demanded, and the affair was transacted by the college of *cardinals* alone, who have continued to maintain that exclusive and important privilege even to our times. Some writers affirm, that INNOCENT II had been elected in the same manner, by the *cardinals* alone, without the consent of the clergy or the people, several years before the pontificate of LUCIUS [s]; this may be true, but it is nothing to the purpose; for as the election of INNOCENT II was irregular, it cannot be alledged in the case before us.

VII. From what has been observed in the preceding section we may conclude that the venerable college of *cardinals*, and the extensive authority and important privileges they enjoy at this day, derive their origin from the edict published at the request and under the pontificate of NICOLAS II; that, under the title of *cardinals*, this pontiff comprehended the seven Roman bishops, who were considered as his *suffragans*, and of whom the bishop of *Ostia* was the chief, as also the eight and twenty ministers, who had inspection over the principal Roman churches; and that to these were added, in process of time under ALEXANDER III and other pontiffs,

[(r)] In the original instead of LUCIUS III, we read VICTOR III, which was certainly a mistake of inadvertency in the learned author.]

[s] See PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 615.

new members, in order to appease the resentment of CENT. XI.
 those who looked upon themselves as injured by the edict of NICOLAS, and also to answer other purposes of ecclesiastical policy. We see, also, from an attentive view of this matter, that though the high order of purpled prelates, commonly called *cardinals*, had its rise in the eleventh century, yet it does not seem to have acquired the stable and undisputed authority of a legal council before the following age and the pontificate of ALEXANDER III.

VIII. Though NICOLAS II had expressly acknowledged and confirmed in his edict the right of the emperor to ratify by his consent the election of the pontiff; his eyes were no sooner closed, than the Romans, at the instigation of HILDEBRAND, archdeacon, and afterwards bishop of *Rome*, violated this imperial privilege in the most presumptuous manner. For they not only elected to the pontificate ANSELM, bishop of *Lucca*, who assumed the name of ALEXANDER II, but also solemnly installed him in that high office without so much as consulting the emperor HENRY IV, or giving him the least information of the matter, AGNES, the mother of the young emperor, no sooner received an account of this irregular transaction by the bishops of *Lombardy*, to whom the election of ANSELM was extremely disagreeable, than she assembled a council at *Basil*, and, in order to maintain the authority of her son, who was yet a minor, caused CADOLAUS, bishop of *Parma*, to be created pontiff, under the title of HONORIUS II. Hence arose a long and furious contest between the two rival pontiffs, who maintained their respective pretensions by the force of arms, and presented a scene of bloodshed and horror in the church of CHRIST which was designed to be the center of charity and peace. In this violent contention ALEXANDER triumphed, though he could never engage his obstinate adversary to desist from his pretensions [†].

[†] FERDIN. UGHELLI *Italia Sacra*, tom. ii. p. 166.—JO. JAC. MASCOVIUS *De rebus imperii sub Henrico IV et V*, lib. i. p. 7.—FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontificum Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 385.—MURATORI *Annali d' Italia*, tom. vi. p. 214.

CENT. XI.

Hildebrand
received to
the Pontifi-
cate.

IX. This contest, indeed, was of little consequence when viewed in comparison with the dreadful commotions which HILDEBRAND, who succeeded ALEXANDER, and assumed the name of GREGORY VII, excited both in church and state, and nourished and fomented until the end of his days. This vehement pontiff, who was a Tuscan, born of mean parents, rose, by various steps from the obscure station of a monk of *Cluni*, to the rank of arch-deacon in the Roman church, and, from the time of LEO IX, who treated him with peculiar marks of distinction, was accustomed to govern the Roman pontiffs by his counsels, which had acquired the highest degree of influence and authority. In the year 1073, and the same day that ALEXANDER was interred, he was raised to the pontificate by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals, bishops, abbots, monks, and people, and, consequently, without any regard being paid to the edict of NICOLAS II, and his election was confirmed by the approbation and consent of HENRY IV, king of the Romans, to whom ambassadors had been sent for that purpose. This prince, indeed, had soon reason to repent of the consent he had given to an election which became so prejudicial to his own authority, so fatal to the interests and liberties of the church, and so detrimental, in general, to the sovereignty and independence of kingdoms and empires [u]. HILDEBRAND was a man of uncommon genius, whose ambition in forming the most arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution; sagacious, crafty, and intrepid, nothing could escape his

[u] The writers, who have given the amplest accounts of the life and exploits of GREGORY VII, are enumerated by CASP. SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introd. ad Hist. Ecclesiast.* tom. i. p. 687. and by AND. SCHMIDTUS, in his *Supplement*, tom. ii. p. 627. — See also the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. v. *Maii ad d. xxv.* p. 568. and MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ordin. Benedicti Sæcul.* vi. p. 406. Add to these *The Life of Gregory VII.* published at *Francfort* in the year 1710, by JUST. CHRISTOPHER DITHMAR, as also the authors, who have written the history of the contests that arose between the Empire and the Hierarchy of Rome, and of the wars that were occasioned by the dispute concerning *Investitures*.

penetration, defeat his stratagems, or daunt his courage; haughty and arrogant beyond all measure; obstinate, impetuous, and intractable; he looked up to the summit of universal empire with a wishful eye, and laboured up the steep ascent with uninterrupted ardor, and invincible perseverance; void of all principle, and destitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he suffered little restraint in his audacious pursuits from the dictates of religion or the remonstrances of conscience. Such was the character of HILDEBRAND, and his conduct was every way suitable to it; for no sooner did he find himself in the papal chair, than he displayed to the world the most odious marks of his tyrannic ambition. Not contented to enlarge the jurisdiction and to augment the opulence of the see of *Rome*, he laboured indefatigably to render the universal church subject to the despotic government, and the arbitrary power of the pontiff alone, to dissolve the jurisdiction which kings and emperors had hitherto exercised over the various orders of the clergy, and to exclude them from all part in the management or distribution of the revenues of the church. Nay, this outrageous pontiff went still farther, and impiously attempted to submit to his jurisdiction the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth, and to render their dominions tributary to the see of *Rome*. Such were the *pious* and *apostolic* exploits that employed the activity of GREGORY VII, during his whole life, and which rendered his pontificate, a continued scene of tumult, and bloodshed. Were it necessary to bring any farther proofs of his tyranny and arrogance, his fierce impetuosity and boundless ambition, we might appeal to those famous *sentences*, which are generally called after him, the *dictates of Hildebrand*, and which shew in a lively manner the spirit and character of this restless pontiff [w].

X. Under

[w] *Dictatus Hildebrandini*. By these are understood xxvii apothegms, or short sentences, relating to the supreme authority of the Roman pontiffs over the universal church, and the kingdoms of the world, which are to be found in the 2d book of the Epistles of GREGORY

CENT. XI. X. Under the pontificate of HILDEBRAND, the face
 ——— of the Latin church was entirely changed, its govern-
 His exploits, ment subverted, and the most important and valuable

GREGORY VII, between the LV, and the LVIIth Epistle, under the title of *Dictatus Papæ*. i. e. *Dictates of the Pope*. See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. vi. part. I. p. 1304, and the various writers of Ecclesiastical History. BARONIUS, LUPUS *, and other historians; who have signalized upon all occasions, their vehement attachment to the Roman pontiffs, maintain, that these *Dictates* were drawn up by GREGORY VII, and proposed as laws in a certain council; and hence the *Protestant* writers have ventured to attribute them to HILDEBRAND. But the learned JOHN LAUNOY, NATALIS ALEXANDER, ANTONY † and FRANCIS PAGI ‡, ELIAS DU PIN, and other authors of note affirm in the most positive manner that these *sentences*, or *dictates*, were a downright forgery imposed upon the world under the name of GREGORY by some perfidious impostor, who proposed thereby to flatter the Roman pontiffs in their ambitious pretensions. As a proof of this assertion they observe, that while some of these *sentences* express indeed in a lively manner the ambitious spirit of GREGORY, there are others which appear entirely opposite to the sentiments of that pontiff, as they are delivered in several parts of his *Epistles*. The French writers have important reasons (which it is not necessary to mention here) for affirming that no Roman pontiff ever presumed to speak of the papal power and jurisdiction in such arrogant terms as are here put into the mouth of GREGORY. It may be easily granted, that these *sentences*, in their present form, are not the composition of this famous pontiff; for many of them are obscure, and they are all thrown together without the least order, method, or connexion; and it is not to be imagined, that a man of such genius, as GREGORY discovered, would have neglected either perspicuity or precision in describing the authority, and fixing, what he looked upon to be, the rights and privileges of the bishops of Rome. But, notwithstanding all this, if we consider the matter of these *sentences*, we shall be entirely persuaded that they belong originally to HILDEBRAND, since we find the greatest part of them repeated word for word in several places in his *Epistles*, and since such of them, as appear inconsistent with some passages in these epistles, are not so in reality, but may be easily explained in perfect conformity with what they are said to contradict. The most probable account of the matter seems to be this: That some mean author extracted these *sentences*, partly from the epistles of GREGORY that are yet extant, partly from those that have perished in the ruins of time, and published them in the form in which they now appear, without judgment or method.

* LUPUS. in his *Notæ et Dissertationes in Concilia*, tom. vi. Opp. p. 164. has given us an ample commentary on the *Dictates of Hildebrand*, which he looks upon as both authentic and sacred.

† See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*.

‡ See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 473.

of those rights and privileges that had been formerly CENT. XI. vested in its councils, bishops, and sacred colleges were usurped by the greedy pontiff. It is, however, to be observed, that the weight of this tyrannic usurpation did not fall equally upon all the European provinces; several of these provinces preserved some remains of their ancient liberty and independence, in the possession of which a variety of circumstances happily concurred to maintain them.

But, as we insinuated above, the views of HILDEBRAND were not confined to the erection of an absolute and universal monarchy in the church; they aimed also at the establishment of a civil monarchy equally extensive and despotic; and this aspiring pontiff, after having drawn up a system of ecclesiastical canons for the government of the church, would have introduced also a new code of political laws, had he been permitted to execute the plan he had formed. His purpose was to engage in the bonds of fidelity and allegiance to St. PETER, *i. e.* to the Roman pontiffs, all the kings and princes of the earth, and to establish at *Rome* an annual assembly of bishops, by whom the contests that might arise between kingdoms or sovereign states were to be decided, the rights and pretensions of princes to be examined, and the fate of nations and empires to be determined. This ambitious project met, however, with the warmest opposition, particularly from the vigilance and resolution of the emperors, and also from the British and French monarchs [*x*].

That HILDEBRAND laid this audacious plan is undoubtedly evident both from his own epistles and also from other authentic records of antiquity. The nature of the oath which he drew up for the king or emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profession of sub-

[[*x*] The long note [*g*] in the original, which contains the ambitious exploits of HILDEBRAND, is inserted in the following paragraph, except the citations, which are thrown into notes.]

jection and allegiance [y], shews abundantly the arrogance of his pretensions. But his conduct towards the kingdom of *France* is worthy of particular notice. It is well known, that whatever dignity and dominion the popes enjoyed, was originally derived from the kingdom of *France*, or, which is the same thing, from the princes of that nation; and yet HILDEBRAND, or, (as we shall hereafter entitle him) GREGORY VII, pretended that the kingdom of *France*, was tributary to the see of *Rome*, and commanded his legates to demand yearly in the most solemn manner the payment of that tribute [z]; their demands, however, were treated with contempt, and the tribute was never either acknowledged or offered. Nothing can be more insolent than the language in which GREGORY addresses himself to PHILIP I, king of *France*, to whom he recommends an humble and obliging carriage, from this consideration that both his kingdom and his soul were under the dominion of St. PETER (*i. e.* his vicar the Roman pontiff) who had the power to BIND and to LOOSE him, both in heaven and upon earth [a]. Nothing escaped the all-grasping ambition of GREGORY; he pretended that Saxony was a feudal tenure held in subjection to the see of *Rome*, to which it had been formerly yielded by CHARLEMAGNE as a pious offering to St. PETER. He extended also his pretensions

[y] See the ixth book of his Epistles, *Epist. lii*; the form of the oath runs thus: *Ab hac hora et deinceps fidelis ero per rectam fidem B. Petro Apostolo, ejusque vicario Papæ Gregorio et quodcunque ipse Papa præceperit sub his videlicet verbis: PER VERAM OBEDIENTIAM, fideliter, sicut oportet Christianum, observabo. Et eo die, quando eum primitus videro, fideliter per manus meas miles Sancti Petri et ILLIUS officium* What is this else than a formal oath of allegiance.

[z] *Epist. lib. viii. ep. xxiii. in HARDUIN'S Concilia, tom. vi. p. 1476. Dicendum autem est omnibus Gallis et per veram obedientiam præcipiendum, ut unaquæque domus solum unum denarium annuatim solvat Beato Petro, si eum recognoscant patrem et pastorem suum more antiquo.* Every one knows that the demand that was made with the form, *per veram obedientiam*, was supposed to oblige indispensably.

[a] *Lib. vii. Epist. xx. in HARDUIN'S Concilia, tom. vi. p. 1468. Maxime enitere ut B. Petrum in cujus potestate est regnum tuum et anima tua, qui te potest in cælo et in terra ligare et absolvere, tibi facias debitorem.*

to the kingdom of *Spain*, maintaining, in one of his letters [b], that it was the property of the apostolic see from the earliest times of the church, yet acknowledging in another [c], that the transaction by which the successors of St. PETER had acquired this property had been lost among other ancient records. His claims, however, were more respected in *Spain* than they had been in *France*; for it is proved most evidently by authentic records, that the king of *Arragon*, and BERNHARD, count of *Besalu*, gave a favourable answer to the demands of GREGORY, and paid him regularly an annual tribute [d]; and their example was followed by other Spanish princes, as we could shew, were it necessary, by a variety of arguments. The despotic views of this lordly pontiff were attended with less success in *England*, than in any other country. WILLIAM the Conqueror was a prince of great spirit and resolution, extremely jealous of his rights, and tenacious of the prerogatives he enjoyed as a sovereign and independent monarch; and accordingly when GREGORY wrote him a letter demanding the arrears of the *Peter pence* [e], and at the same time summoning him to do homage for the kingdom of *England* as a fief of the apostolic see, WILLIAM granted the former, but refused the latter [f] with a noble obstinacy,

[b] Lib. x. ep. vii. *Regnum Hispaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuisse et soli Apostolicæ sedis ex æquo pertinere.*

[c] Lib. x. epist. xxviii.

[d] See PETRUS DE MARCA *Histoire de Bearn*, lib. iv. p. 331, 332.

[e] *Peter-pence* (so called from its being collected on the festival of St. Peter in Vinculis) was an ancient tax of a penny on each house, first granted, in the year 725, by INA, king of the West-Saxons, for the establishment and support of an English college at *Rome*, and afterwards extended, in the year 794, by OFFA over all *Mercia* and *East-Anglia*. In process of time it became a standing and general tax throughout all *England*, and, though it was for some time applied to the support of the English college according to its original design, the popes found means to appropriate it to themselves. It was confirmed by the laws of CANUTE, EDWARD the Confessor, WILLIAM the Conqueror, &c. and was never totally abolished till the reign of HENRY VIII.]

[f] The letter of WILLIAM is extant in the *Miscellanea* of BALUZIUS, tom. vii. p. 127. as also in COLLIER'S *Ecclesiastical History* in Vol. II.

CENT. XI. obstinacy, declaring that he held his kingdom, of God only, and his own sword. Obligated to yield to the obstinacy of the English monarch, whose name struck terror into the boldest hearts, the restless pontiff addressed his imperious mandates where he imagined they would be received with more facility. He wrote circular letters to all the most powerful German princes [g], to GEUSA king of Hungary [b], and SUENO, or SWEIN, king of Denmark [i], soliciting them to make a solemn grant of their kingdoms and territories to the prince of the apostles, and to hold them under the jurisdiction of his vicar at Rome, as fiefs of the apostolic see. What success attended his demands upon these princes, we cannot say; but certain it is, that in several places his efforts were effectual, and his *modest* proposals were received with the utmost docility and zeal. The son of DEMETRIUS, king of the Russians, set out for Rome, in consequence of the pontiff's letter [k], in order to *obtain as a gift from St. PETER by the hands of GREGORY, after professing his subjection and allegiance to the prince of the apostles, the kingdom* which was to devolve to him upon the death of his father; and his *pious request* was readily granted by the officious pope, who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. DEMETRIUS SUINMER, duke of Croatia and Dalmatia, was raised to the

the *Collection of Records*, at the end of the first volume, p. 713. N^o 12. *Hubertus legatus tuus* (says the resolute monarch to the audacious pontiff) *admonuit me, quatenus tibi et successoribus tuis fidelitatem facerem, et de pecunia, quam antecessores mei ad ecclesiam mittere solebant, melius cogitarum. Unum admisi alterum non admisi. FIERLITATEM FACERE, NOLUI, NEC VOLO, &c.*

[g] See in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, his famous letter (lib. ix. epist. iii.) to the bishop of Padua, exhorting him to engage WELPHO, duke of Bavaria, and other German princes, to submit themselves and their dominions to the apostolic jurisdiction. *Admonere te volumus* (says the pontiff) *Ducem Welfphonem, ut fidelitatem B. Petro faciet . . . Illum enim totum in gremio Beati Petri collocare desideramus et ad ejus servitium specialiter provocare. Quam voluntatem si in eo, vel etiam in aliis potentibus viris amore B. Petri ductis cognoveris, ut perficiant labores.*

[b] Lib. ii. ep. lxx.

[i] Lib. ii. ep. li.

[k] Lib. iii. ep. lxxiv.

rank and prerogatives of royalty by the same pontiff in CENT. XI. the year 1076, and solemnly proclaimed king by his legate at *Salona*, upon condition that he should pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of gold to St. PETER at every Easter festival [1]. This bold step was injurious to the authority of the emperors of *Constantinople*, who, before this time, comprehended the province of *Croatia* within the limits of their sovereignty. The kingdom of *Poland* became also the object of GREGORY's ambition, and a favourable occasion was offered for the execution of his iniquitous views; for BASILAIUS II. having assassinated STANISLAUS bishop of *Cracow*, the pontiff not only excommunicated him with all the circumstances of infamy that he could invent, but also pulled him from his throne, dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken, and, by an express and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of *Poland* from electing a new king without the consent of the Roman pontiff [m]. Many more examples might be alledged of the phrenetic ambition of GREGORY, but those which have been already mentioned are sufficient to excite the indignation of every impartial reader. Had the success of that pontiff been equal to the extent of his insolent views, all the kingdoms of *Europe* would have been this day tributary to the Roman see, and its princes the soldiers or vassals of St. PETER, in the person of his pretended vicar upon earth. But though his most important projects were ineffectual, yet many of his attempts were crowned with a favourable issue; for from the time of his pontificate the face of *Europe* underwent a considerable change, and the prerogatives of the emperors and other sovereign princes, were much diminished. It was, particularly, under the administration of GREGORY, that the emperors were deprived of the privilege of ratifying, by their consent, the election of the Roman pontiff, a privilege of no small importance, and which as yet they have never recovered.

[1] See DU MONT *Corps Diplomatique*, tom. i. part. I. n. 88. p. 53.

—JO. LUCIUS *De regna Dalmatiae*, lib. ii. p. 85.

[m] See DLUGOSI *Hist. Polon.* tom. i. p. 295.

CENT. XI.

XI. The zeal and activity which GREGORY employed in extending the jurisdiction of the Roman see, and enriching the patrimony of St. PETER, met, no where, with such remarkable success as in *Italy*. His intimate familiarity with MATHILDA, the daughter of BONIFACE duke of *Tuscany*, and the most powerful and opulent princess in that country (who found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguished the tender passions in the heart of GREGORY) contributed much to this success; for he engaged that princess, after the death of her husband GODFREY, duke of *Lorrain*, and her mother BEATRIX, which happened in the years 1076 and 1077, to settle all her possessions in *Italy* and elsewhere upon the church of *Rome*, and thus to appoint St. PETER and his pretended vicar the heirs of her immense treasures. This rich donation was, indeed, considerably invalidated by the second marriage, which MATHILDA contracted, in the year 1089, with WELPH, or GUELPH, son of the duke of *Bavaria*, and that, with the consent of the Roman pontiff URBAN II. She, however, renewed it in a solemn manner in the year 1102, about seven years after her separation from her second husband, by which she became again sole mistress of her vast possession [n]. But notwithstanding this new act, the Roman pontiffs did not remain in the peaceful pos-

[n] The life and exploits of this heroic princess (who was one of the strongest bulwarks of the Roman church against the power of the emperors, and the most tender and obedient of all the *spiritual* daughters of GREGORY VII) has been written by BENED. LUCHINUS, DOMIN. MELLINUS, FELIX CONTELORIUS, JULIUS DE PUTEO, but more amply by FRANCIS MARIA FLORENT. in his *Records concerning the countess Mathilda*, wrote in Italian, and BENED. BACHINIUS, in his *Historia Monasterii Podalironensis*. The famous LEIBNITZ, in his *Scriptores Brunsvic.* tom. i. p. 629. and LUD. ANT. MURATORI, in his *Scriptores rerum Italic.* tom. v. p. 335. have published, with annotations, the ancient histories of the life of MATHILDA, composed by DONIZO, and another writer whose name is unknown, together with the copy of the second act of cession by which that princess confirmed her former grant to the church of *Rome*. We may add here, that nothing relating to this extraordinary woman is more worthy of perusal than the accounts that we find of her, and her second husband, in the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. v. p. 444. et tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 303.

cession

session of this splendid inheritance. It was warmly and CENT. XI.
powerfully disputed, first by the emperor HENRY V, and
afterwards by several other princes; nor were the pontiffs
so successful in this contest as to preserve the whole in-
heritance, though, after various struggles and efforts,
they remained in the possession of a considerable part of
it, which they still enjoy [o].

XII. The

[o] Many learned men concluded from the very Act by which this donation was confirmed to the see of Rome, that MATHILDA, comprehended in this donation only her *allodial* possessions, and not the territories which she held as *fiefs of the empire*, such as the marquisate of Tuscany, and the dutchy of Spoleto. For the words of the act run thus: *Ego Mathildis . . . dedi et obtuli ecclesie S. Petri . . . omnia mea bona* JURE PROPRIETARIO, *tam quæ tunc habueram, quam ea, quæ in antea adquisitura eram, sive jure successionis, sive alio quocunque jure ad me pertinent.* See the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. p. 448. But it is much to be questioned, whether this distinction is so evident, as is pretended. For the words JURE PROPRIETARIO, from which it is inferred, that MATHILDA disposed of only her *allodial* possessions in favour of St. PETER, don't in my opinion, relate to the possessions of the testatrix, but to the nature of the gift, and must be interpreted in conjunction with the preceding verbs, *dedi et obtuli*. For the princefs does not say, *dedi omnia bona, quæ JURE PROPRIETARIO possideo et habeo*, i. e. *I have granted that part of my property which I hold by a supreme and independent right*, in which case the opinion of the learned men above-mentioned would be well founded, but she says, *dedi omnia bona mea ecclesie JURE PROPRIETARIO*, i. e. *my will is, that the church should possess as its own property the inheritance I have left it*. Besides, the following words manifestly shew, that the opinion of these learned men is destitute of all foundation; since MATHILDA could not possibly add, *sive jure successionis, sive alio quocunque jure ad me pertineant*, i. e. *I grant all my possessions under whatever title I enjoy them, whether by right of succession, or by ANY OTHER RIGHT, &c.* had she designed to confine her donation to her *allodial* possessions. Certain it is, that in this ample grant she excepts no particular part of her property, but evidently comprehends in it her whole substance. If it be objected to this, that the Roman pontiffs never affirmed that the *fiefs of the empire*, which MATHILDA possessed, were comprehended in this grant to their church, and that they only claimed her *allodial* and independent possessions; I answer, by questioning the fact, since many circumstances concur to prove, that these pontiffs claimed the whole substance of MATHILDA, all her possessions without exception, as their undoubted right. But suppose for a moment, that the case was otherwise, and that the Roman church had never made such an universal claim, this would, by no means, invalidate the opinion I here maintain; since the question, under consideration, is not, how far the Roman pontiffs may have moderated their pretensions to the territories of MA-

CENT. XI.

The decrees
of Gregory
VII.

XII. The plan that GREGORY had formed for raising the church above all human authority to a state of perfect supremacy and independence, had many kinds of opposition to encounter, but none more unsurmountable than that which arose from the two reigning vices of concubinage and simony, that had infected the whole body of the European clergy. The Roman pontiffs, from the time of STEPHEN IX, had combated, with zeal and vehemence, these monstrous vices [p], but without success, as they were become too inveterate and too universal to be extirpated without the greatest difficulty and the most extraordinary efforts. Accordingly GREGORY, in the year 1074, which was the second

of THILDA, but what is the true and genuine sense of the words in which her donation is expressed.

[p] *Monstrous vices* we may justly call them. For though it be true, that in the methods GREGORY took to extirpate these vices, he violated not only the laws of religion, but also the dictates of natural equity and justice, and, under the mask of a pious zeal, committed the most crying and abominable enormities; yet it is certain, on the other hand, that these vices produced the most unhappy effects of both in church and state, and that the suppression of them was now become absolutely necessary. There were indeed, among the clergy, several men of piety and virtue who lived in the bonds of wedlock, and these GREGORY ought to have spared. But there was also a prodigious number of ecclesiastics throughout Europe, not only of priests and canons, but also of monks, who lived in the bonds of a criminal love, kept, under the title of wives, mistresses which they dismissed, at pleasure, to enjoy the sweets of a licentious variety, and who not only spent, in the most profuse and scandalous manner, the revenues and treasures of the churches and convents to which they belonged, but even distributed a great part of them among their bastards. As to the vice of *simony*, its universal extent in its pernicious fruits appear evidently from those records, which the Benedictine monks have published in several places of their *Gallia Christiana*, not to mention a multitude of other ancient papers to the same purpose. One or two examples will be sufficient to give the reader an idea of this matter. We find in the first volume of the admirable work now mentioned (in the *Append. Document. p. 5.*) a public act, by which BERNARD a viscount, and FROTIERUS bishop of *Alby*, grant, or rather sell, openly to BERNARD AIMARD and his son the bishopric of *Alby*, reserving to themselves a considerable part of its revenues. This act is followed by another, in which count PONTIUS bequeaths to his wife the same bishopric of *Alby* in the following terms: *Ego Pontius dono tibi dilectæ sponsæ meæ episcopatum Albiensem—cum ipsa ecclesia et cum omni adjacentia sua—et medietatem de episcopatu Nemauso—et medietatem de abbatia*

of his pontificate, exerted himself with much more vigour than his predecessors had done in opposition to the vices already mentioned. For this purpose he assembled a council at *Rome*, in which all the laws of the former pontiffs against *simony* were renewed and confirmed, and the buying or selling ecclesiastical benefices prohibited in the strictest and severest manner. It was also decreed in the same council, that the sacerdotal orders should abstain from marriage, and that such of them as had already wives, or concubines, should immediately dismiss them, or quit the priestly office. These decrees were accompanied with circular letters wrote by the pontiff to all the European bishops, enjoining the strictest obedience to the decisions of this solemn council, under the severest penalties. GREGORY did not stop here, but sent ambassadors into *Germany* to HENRY IV, king of the Romans, in order to engage that prince to summon a council for the trial and punishment of such ecclesiastics, as had been hitherto guilty of simoniacal practices.

XIII These decrees, which were in part equitable and just, and which were in every respect, conformable with the notions of religion that prevailed in this age, were looked upon by the people as highly salutary, since they

The severe proceedings of the pontiff against concubinage produce much trouble.

batia Sti. Aegidii—post obitum tuum remaneat iphus alodis ad infantes qui de me erunt creati. In the second volume of the same learned work (in the *Append. Document.* p. 173.) there is a letter of the clergy of *Limoges*, beseeching WILLIAM, count of *Aquitain*, not to sell the bishopric, but to give them a pastor, and not a devourer of the flock. *Rogamus tuam pietatem, ne propter mandiale lucrum vendas Sti. Stephani locum, quia si tu vendas episcopalia, ipse nostra manducabit communia—Mitte nobis ovium custodem, non devorantem.* ADEMAR, viscount of *Limoges*, laments (tom. ii. p. 179.) that he himself had formerly made traffic of the cure of souls by selling benefices to simoniacal abbots. The barefaced impudence of the sacerdotal orders in buying and selling benefices, exceeded all measure, and almost all credibility. And they carried matters so far as to justify that abominable traffic, as may be seen in a remarkable passage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, which is added, by PITHOU, to the *Codex Can. Ecclesiæ Romanæ*; this passage, which deserves to be quoted, is as follows: *Nil pæne ad ecclesiam prætinere videtur, quod ad pretium non largiatur, scilicet episcopatus, presbyteratus, diaconatus, et aliqui minores gradus, archidiaconatus quoque, decania, præpositura, thesauri custodia, baptisterium—et bujusmodi negociatores subdola responsione solent astruere, non se emere benedictionem, quâ percipiuntur gratia spiritus sancti, sed res ecclesiarum vel possessiones episcopi.* An acute distinction truly!

CENT. XI. rendered a free election, and not a mercenary purchase, the way to ecclesiastical promotion, and obliged the priests to abstain from marriage, which was absurdly considered as inconsistent with the sanctity of their office. Yet both these decrees were attended with the most deplorable tumults and dissensions, and were fruitful, in their consequences, of innumerable calamities. No sooner was the law concerning the *Celibacy of the Clergy* published, than the priests, in the several provinces of *Europe*, who lived in the bonds of marriage with lawful wives, or of lasciviousness with hired concubines [q], complained loudly of the severity of this council, and excited the most dreadful tumults in the greatest part of the European provinces. Many of these ecclesiastics, especially the Milanese priests, chose rather to abandon their spiritual dignities than their sensual pleasures, and to quit their benefices that they might cleave to their wives. They went still farther: for they separated themselves entirely from the church of *Rome*, and branded with the infamous name of *Paterini* [r], i. e. Manichæans,

[q] All the historians, who give any accounts of this century, mention the tumults excited by such priests, as were resolved to continue with their wives or concubines. For an account of the seditions which arose in *Germany* upon this occasion, see *SIGONIUS De Regno Italia*, lib. ix. p. 557. tom. ii. as also *TENGNAEL's Collectio Veter. Monument.* p. 45. 47. 54. Those that the priests excited in *England* are mentioned by *M. PARIS*, in his *Histor. Major*, lib. i. p. 7. The tumults occasioned by the same reason in the *Belgic* and *Gallic* provinces, are described in the *Epistola Clericorum Cameracensium ad Remenses. pro uxoribus suis*, published in *MABILLON's Annal. Benedictin.* tom. v. p. 634. and in the *Epistola Noviomensium Clericorum ad Cameracenses*, published in *MABILLON's Museum Italicum*, tom. i. p. 128. Great was the flame which the laws of *GREGORY* excited in *Italy*, and particularly in the province of *Milan*, of which we have an ample relation given by *ARNULPH* and *LANDULPH*, two Milanese historians, whose works are published, with annotations, by *MURATORI*, in his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iv. p. 36. Both these historians maintain against *GREGORY* and his successors the cause of the injured priests, and the lawfulness of their marriages.

[r] *Paterinus* is one of the names by which the Paulicians or Manichæans (who came during this century from *Bulgaria* into *Italy*, and were also known by the title of *Cathari* or *Pure*) were distinguished among the Italians. But in process of time the term *Paterinus* became a common

Manichæans, the pontiff and his adherents who condemned so unjustly the conduct of such priests as entered into the bonds of a lawful and virtuous wedlock. The proceedings of GREGORY appeared to the wiser part even of those who approved of the celibacy of the clergy, unjust and criminal in two respects: First, in that his severity fell indiscriminately and with equal fury upon the virtuous husband, and the licentious rake, and that he dissolved, with a merciless hand, the chastest bonds of wedlock, and thus involved husbands and wives with their tender offspring in disgrace, perplexity, anguish, and want [s]. The second thing criminal in the measures

common name for all kinds of heretics, as we might shew by many examples taken from the writers of the XII and XIIIth centuries. There are various opinions concerning the origin of this word, the most probable of which is that which supposes it derived from a certain place called *Pataria*, in which the heretics held their assemblies; and it is well known, that a part of the city of *Milan* is, to this very day, called *Pataria*, or *Contrada de Patarri*. See *Adnotat. ad Arnulphum Mediolanens.* in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* tom. iv. p. 39. see also SAXIUS *ad Sigonium de Regno Italiæ*, lib. ix. p. 536. tom. ii. Opp. *Sigonii*. An opinion (of which, if I am not mistaken, SIGONIUS was the author) prevailed, that the name in question was given to the Milanese priests, who separated from the church of *Rome*, and retained their wives in opposition to the laws of the pontiffs. But this opinion is without foundation; and it appears evidently from the testimony of ARNULPH and other historians, that it was not the married priests, but the faction of the pontiffs, who condemned their conjugal bonds, that were branded with the opprobrious name of *Patarini*. See ARNULPH. lib. iii. c. x.—ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Annal. Baron.* tom. iii. ad. A. 1057. § iii.—LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 82. who have demonstrated this in the most ample, learned, and satisfactory manner. Nor need we, indeed, look any where else for the origin of this word. It is abundantly known that the Manichæans, and their brethren the Paulicians, were extremely averse to marriage, which they looked upon as an institution invented by the evil principle; they, of consequence, who considered the marriages of the clergy as lawful, employed the ignominious name of *Paterini*, to shew that the pontiffs, who prohibited these marriages, were followers of the odious doctrine of the Manichæans.

[s] We must always remember that the priests, to whom their wives or mistresses were much dearer than the laws of the pontiffs, were not all of the same character: nor were such of them as might be justly esteemed criminal, all criminal in the same degree. The better sort of these ecclesiastics (among which we may count the Belgic and Milanese clergy) desired nothing more than to live after the manner of the Greeks, maintaining

CENT. XI. fures taken by this pontiff was, that instead of chastising the married priests with wisdom and moderation, and according to the laws of ecclesiastical discipline, whose nature is wholly spiritual, he gave them over to the civil magistrate to be punished as disobedient and unworthy subjects with the loss of their substance, and with the most shocking marks of undeserved infamy and disgrace [t].

The disputes concerning investitures occasioned by the laws against simony.

XIV. This vehement contest excited great tumults and divisions, which, however, were gradually calmed through length of time, and also by the perseverance of the obstinate pontiff; nor did any of the European kings and princes concern themselves so much about the marriages of the clergy as to maintain their cause, and thereby to prolong the controversy. But the troubles that arose from the law that regarded the extirpation of *simony* were not so easily appeased; the tumults it occasioned grew greater from day to day; the methods of reconciliation more difficult; and it involved both state and church during several years in the deepest ca-

maintaining that it was lawful for a priest, before his consecration, to marry one virgin, though a plurality of wives was justly prohibited; and they grounded this their opinion upon the authority of St. AMBROSE. See JO. PETRI PURICELLI *Dissertatio utrum S. Ambrosius clero suo Mediolan. permiserit, ut virgini semel nubere possent*, republished by MURATORI, in his *Scriptores Italic.* tom. iv. p. 123. GREGORY and his successors ought to have dealt more gently with this kind of ecclesiastics (as the warmest admirers of the pontiffs acknowledge) than with those priests, who were either the patrons of concubinage, or who pretended to justify their espousing a plurality of wives. It was also unjust to treat, in the same manner, the monks, who, by the nature of their profession and vows, were necessarily excluded from the nuptial state; and the priests, who could not bear the thoughts of being torn from the chaste partners of their bed, whom they had espoused with virtuous sentiments and upright intentions, nor from the tender offspring which were the fruit of virtuous love.

[t] THEODORICUS, *Verdun. Epistola ad Gregorium VII.* in *Martene Thesauro Anecdotorum*, tom. i. p. 218.—*Faciem meam in eo vel maxime confusione perfundunt, quod legem de Clericorum Incontinentia PER LAICORUM INSANIAS cobibenda unquam susceperim.*—*Nec putetis eos qui ita sentiunt . . . ecclesiasticorum graduum incontinentiam talibus defensionibus fovere velle. Honestam conversationem in desiderio habent, nec aliter, quam oporet, ECCLESIASTICÆ ULTIONIS CENSURAM intentari gaudent.*

lamities

calamities and in the most complicated scenes of confusion and distress [u]. HENRY IV received, indeed, graciously the legates of GREGORY, and applauded his zeal for the extirpation of *simony*; but neither this prince, nor the German bishops, would permit these legates to assemble a council in *Germany*, or to proceed judicially against those, who, in time past, had been chargeable with simoniacal practices. The pontiff, exasperated at this restraint in the execution of his designs, called another council to meet at *Rome* in the year 1075, in which he pursued his adventurous project with greater

[u] We have extant a great number both of ancient and modern writers, who have related the circumstances of this dispute concerning *investitures*, which was begun by GREGORY VII, was carried on by him and his successors on the one side, and the emperors HENRY IV and V on the other, and became a source of innumerable calamities to the greatest part of *Europe*. But few or none of these writers have treated this weighty subject with an entire impartiality. They all plead either the cause of the pontiffs, or that of the emperors, and decide the controversy, not by the laws then in being (which ought, no doubt, to be principally consulted) nor by the opinions that generally prevailed at the time of this contest, but by laws of their own invention, and by the opinions of modern times. The famous GRETZER, in his *Apologia pro Gregorio VII*, which is published in the 6th volume of his works, and also separately, has collected the principal of the ancient writers who maintain the cause of the pontiff; in opposition to whom, they who defended the cause of HENRY IV, are collected by MELCHIOR GOLDASTUS, in his *Replicatio contra Gretserum et Apologia pro Henrico IV*, Hanov. 1611, 4to. Among the modern writers who have treated this subject, we may count the *Centuriatores Magdeburgenses*, BARONIUS, the German and Italian historians, and those who have wrote the life of the famous MATHILDA. But, beside these, it will be highly proper to consult Jo. SCHILTERUS *De libertate Ecclesiæ Germanicæ*, lib. iv. p. 481.—CHRIST. THOMASIUS *Historia contentions inter Imperium et Sacerdotium*.—HEN. MEIBOMIUS *Lib de jure Investituræ Episcopalis* tom. iii. *Scriptorum rer. Germanicar.*—JUST. CHR. DITHMARUS *Historia Belli inter Imperium et Sacerdotium*, published at *Francfort* in 1741, in 8vo. and, above all, the famous Cardinal NORIS, who far surpasses in point of erudition those whom we have mentioned, and whose *Historia delle Investiture della dignità Ecclesiastica*, which was published at *Mantua*, after his death, in the year 1741, is a most learned work, though it be imperfect and probably maimed, and also extremely partial in favour of the pontiffs, which is not surprizing from the pen of a cardinal. See also Jo. JAC. MASCOVII *Commentarii de rebus imperii Germanici sub Henrico IV et V*, published at *Leipsick* in 4to. in the year 1749.

impe-

CENT. XI. impetuosity and vehemence than ever; for he not only excluded from the communion of the church several German and Italian bishops and certain favorites of HENRY, whose counsels that prince was said to make use of in the traffic of ecclesiastical dignities, but also pronounced in a formal edict, *Anathema against whoever received the investiture of a bishopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, as also against those by whom the investiture should be performed* [w]. This decree was every way proper to surprize the emperors, kings, and princes of Europe, who, in consequence of a prevailing custom, had the right of conferring the more important ecclesiastical dignities and the government of monasteries and convents, of which they disposed, in a solemn manner, by the well-known ceremony of the *ring* and the *staff*, or *crozier*, which they presented to the candidate on whom their choice fell. This solemn investiture was the main support of that power of creating bishops and abbots, which the European princes claimed as their undoubted right, and the occasion of that corrupt commerce called *simony*, in consequence of which ecclesiastical promotion was impudently sold to the highest bidder; and hence the zeal and ardour of GREGORY to annul these investitures, that he might extirpate *simony* on the one hand, and diminish the power of princes in ecclesiastical matters on the other.

A short digression concerning INVESTITURES [x].

IT will not be improper to cast some illustrations upon the custom now mentioned of investing bishops and abbots in their respective dignities by the ceremony of the *ring* and *crozier*, since this custom has been ill understood by some, and but imperfectly explained by others. Even the learned cardinal NORIS appears highly

[w] ANT. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. ad A. 1075.—HENR. NORIS *Hist. Investiturarum*, p. 39.—CHRIST. LUPUS *Scholia et Dissertation, ad Concilia*, tom. vi. Opp. p. 39.—44.

[x] Here the translator has transposed the note [r] of the original into the text under the form of a dissertation.

defective here; for though in his *History of Investitures* CENT. XI. [y], there are many pertinent reflexions upon the reasons which engaged GREGORY to prohibit *investitures* altogether, yet that learned prelate does not seem to have a complete notion of this important matter, since he omits in his history certain points that are necessary to the understanding it thoroughly. The *investiture* of bishops and abbots commenced, undoubtedly, at that period of time when the European emperors, kings, and princes made grants to the clergy of certain territories, lands, forests, castles, &c. According to the laws of those times (laws which still remain in force) none were considered as lawful possessors of the lands or tenements which they derived from the emperors or other princes, before they repaired to court, took the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns as the supreme proprietors, and received from their hands a solemn mark by which the property of their respective grants was transferred to them. Such was the manner in which the nobility, and those who had distinguished themselves by military exploits, were confirmed in the possessions which they owed to the liberality of their sovereigns. But the custom of *investing* the bishops and abbots with the *ring* and the *crozier*, which are the ensigns of the sacred function, is of a much more recent date, and was then first introduced, when the European emperors and princes, annulling the elections that were made in the church according to the ecclesiastical laws that had been from the earliest times established for that purpose, assumed to themselves the power of conferring on whom they pleased the bishoprics and abbeys that became vacant in their dominions, nay, even of selling them to the highest bidder. This power, then, being once usurped by the kings and princes of *Europe*, they at first confirmed the bishops and abbots in their dignities and possessions with the same forms and ceremonies that were used in investing the counts, knights, and others in their feudal tenures, even by written contracts, and the ceremony of

CENT. XI. presenting them with a wand or bough [z]. And this custom of *investing* the *clergy* and the *laity* with the same ceremonies would have, undoubtedly, continued, had not the *clergy*, to whom the right of electing bishops and abbots originally belonged, eluded artfully the usurpation of the emperors and other princes by the following stratagem. When a bishop or abbot died, they who looked upon themselves as authorised to fill up the vacancy, elected immediately some one of their order in the place of the deceased, and were careful to have him consecrated without delay. The consecration being thus performed, the prince, who had proposed to himself the profit of selling the vacant benefice, or the pleasure of conferring it upon some of his favorites, was obliged to desist from his purpose, and to consent to the election which the ceremony of consecration rendered irrevocable. Many examples of the success of this stratagem, which was practised both in chapters and monasteries, and which disappointed the liberality or avarice of several princes, might here be alledged; they abound in the records of the xth century, to which we refer the curious reader. No sooner did the emperors and princes perceive this artful management, than they turned their attention to the properest means of rendering it ineffectual, and of preserving the valuable privilege they had usurped. For this purpose they ordered, that as soon as a bishop expired, his *ring* and *crozier* should be transmitted to the prince, to whose jurisdiction his diocese was subject. For it was by the solemn delivery of

[z] This appears from a passage in Cardinal HUMBERT's III d Book, *Adversus Simoniacos*, which was composed before GREGORY had set on foot the dispute concerning *Investitures*, and which is published in MARTENE's *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 787. The passage is as follows: *Potestas secularis primo ambitiosis ecclesiasticarum dignitatum vel possessionum cupidis favebat prece, dein minis, deinceps verbis concessivis: in quibus omnibus cernens sibi contradictorem neminem, nec qui moveret pennam, vel aperiret os et ganniret, ad majora progreditur, et jam sub nomine INVESTITURÆ DARE PRIMO TABELLAS vel QUALESCUMQUE PORRIGERE VIRGULAS, DEIN BACULOS — Quod maximum nefas sic inolevit, ut id solum canonicum credatur, nec quæ sit ecclesiastica regula sciatur aut attendatur.*

the *ring* and *crozier* of the deceased to the new bishop CENT. XI.
 that his election was irrevocably confirmed, and this ceremony was an essential part of his *consecration*; so that when these two badges of the episcopal dignity were in the hands of the sovereign, the clergy could not *consecrate* the person whom their suffrages had appointed to fill the vacancy. Thus their stratagem was defeated, as every election that was not confirmed by the ceremony of consecration might be lawfully annulled and rejected; nor was the bishop qualified to exercise any of the episcopal functions before the performance of that important ceremony. As soon, therefore, as a bishop drew his last breath, the magistrate of the city in which he had resided, or the governor of the province, seized upon his *ring* and *crozier*, and sent them to court [a]. The emperor or prince conferred the vacant see upon the person whom he had chosen, by delivering to him these two badges of the episcopal office, after which the new bishop, thus invested by his sovereign, repaired to his metropolitan, to whom it belonged to perform the ceremony of consecration, and delivered to him the *ring* and *crozier* which he had received from his prince, that he might receive it again from his hands, and be thus doubly confirmed in his sacred function. It appears, therefore, from this account, that each new bishop and abbot received twice the *ring* and the *staff*; once from the hands of the sovereign, and once from those of the metropolitan bishop, by whom they were consecrated [b].

It

[a] We see this fact confirmed by the following passage in EBBO'S *Life of Otho, bishop of Bamberg*, lib. i § 8, 9. in *Actis Sanctor. mensis Julii*, tom. i. p. 426. *Nec multo post annulus cum virgâ pastorali Bremensis episcopi ad aulam regiam translata est. Eo siquidem tempore ecclesia liberam electionem non habebat . . . sed cum quilibet antistes viam universæ carnis ingressus fuisset, mox capitanei civitatis illius annulum et virgam pastorem ad Palatium trans mittebant, sicque regia auctoritate, communicato cum aulicis concilio, orbatæ plebi idoneum constituerebat præfulem . . . Post paucos vero dies rursum annulus et virga pastoralis Bambergensis episcopi Domino imperatori transmissa est. Quod audito, multi nobiles ad aulam regiam consuebant, qui alteram harum prece vel pretio sibi comparare tentabant.*

[b] This appears from a variety of ancient records. See particularly
HUM.

CENT. XI.

It is highly uncertain by what prince this custom of creating the bishops by the ceremonies of the *ring* and *crozier* was first introduced. If we may believe ADAM of *Bremen* [c], this privilege was exercised by LEWIS the Meek, who, in the ixth century, granted to the new bishops the use and possession of the episcopal revenues, and confirmed this grant by the ceremony now under consideration. But the accuracy of this historian is liable to suspicion, and it is extremely probable that he attributed to the transactions of ancient times the same form that accompanied similar transactions in the xth century in which he lived. For it is certain, that in the ixth century the greatest part of the European princes made no opposition to the right of electing the bishops, which was both claimed and exercised by the clergy and the people, and, of consequence, there was then no occasion for the investiture mentioned by ADAM of *Bremen* [d]. We therefore chuse to adopt the supposition of Cardinal HUMBERT [e], who places the commencement of the custom now under consideration in the reign of ORTHO the great; for though this opinion has not the approbation of LEWIS THOMASSIN and NATALIS ALEXANDER, yet these learned men, in their deep researches into the origin of investitures [f], have advanced nothing

HUMBERT, Lib. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vi. in MARTENE's *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 779. in which we find the following passage: *Sic encæniatus* (i. e. the bishops invested by the emperor) *violentes invadit clorum, plebem et ordinem dominaturus, quam ab eis cognoscatur, quæatur, petatur. Sic metropolitanum aggreditur, non ab eo judicandus, sed ipsum judicaturus.—Quid enim sibi jam pertinet aut prodest baculum et annulum, quos portat REDDERE? Numquid quia laica persona dati sunt? Cur redditur quod habetur, nisi ut aut denuo res ecclesiastica sub hac specie jussionis vel donationis vendatur, aut in priore venditione corroboranda a metropolitano, suisque suffraganeis subscribatur, aut certe ut præsumptio laicæ ordinationis paliatur colore et velamento quodam disciplinæ clericalis.*

[c] In his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. i. cap. xxxii. p. 10. xxxix. p. 12. published in the *Scriptores Septentrionales* of LINDENBROGIUS.

[d] Add to this the refutation of ADAM of *Bremen*, by DANIEL PAPBROCH, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Febr. p. 557.

[e] HUMBERT. Lib. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vii. p. 780. et cap. xi. p. 787.

[f] See LUDOV. THOMASSINI *Disciplina Eccles. circa. Benef.* tom. ii.

thing sufficient to prove it erroneous. We learn also from HUMBERT [g], that the emperor HENRY III, the son of CONRAD II, was desirous of abrogating these *investitures*, but that a variety of circumstances concurred to prevent the execution of his design; but he represents HENRY I king of *France* in a different point of light, as a turbulent prince, who turned all things into confusion, and indulged himself beyond all measure in simonical practices, and loads him, of consequence, with the bitterest invectives.

In this method of creating bishops and abbots by presenting to them the *ring* and *crozier*, there were two things that gave particular offence to the Roman pontiffs. The first was, that by this the ancient right of election was totally changed, and the power of choosing the rulers of the church was usurped by the emperors and other sovereign princes, and was confined to them alone. This indeed was the most plausible reason of complaint, when we consider the religious notions of these times, which were, by no means, favourable to the conduct of the emperors in this matter. Another circumstance that grievously distressed the pretended vicars of St. PETER, was to see the *ring* and *crozier*, the venerable badges of spiritual authority and ghostly distinction, delivered to the bishop elect by the profane hands of unsanctified laymen; an abuse this, which they looked upon as little better than sacrilege. HUMBERT, who, as we already observed, wrote his book against simony before the contest between the emperor and GREGORY had commenced, complains [b] heavily of this

ii. lib. ii. p. 434. and NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Select. Histor. Eccl. Capit. Sac. xi. xii. Diff. iv. p. 725.*

[g] L. c. cap. vii. p. 780.

[b] See HUMBERT *Lib. iii. contra Simoniac. cap. vi. p. 779. 795.* his words are: *Quid ad laicas pertinet personas sacramenta ecclesiastica et pontificalem seu pastorem gratiam distribuere, camyros scilicet baculos et annulos, quibus præcipue perficitur, militat et innititur tota episcopalis consecratio? Equidem in camyris baculis—designatur, quæ eis committitur cura pastoralis.—Porro annulus signaculum secretorum cælestium indicat, præmonens prædicatores, ut secretam Dei sapientiam cum apostolo diffignent.—*

CENT. XI. this supposed profanation, and shudders to think, that that *staff* which denotes the ghostly shepherd, and that *ring* which seals the mysteries of heaven [i], deposited in the bosoms of the episcopal order, should be polluted by the unhallowed touch of a civil magistrate; and that emperors and princes, by presenting them to their favourites, should thereby usurp the prerogatives of the church, and exercise the pastoral authority and power. This complaint was entirely consistent, as we have already observed, with the opinions of the times in which it was made; for as the *ring* and the *crozier* were generally esteemed the marks and badges of pastoral power, and spiritual authority, so he who conferred these sacred badges was supposed to confer and communicate with them the ghostly authority of which they were the emblems.

All these things being duly considered, we shall immediately perceive what it was that rendered GREGORY VII so averse to the pretensions of the emperors, and so zealous in depriving them of the privilege they had assumed of investing the bishops with the ceremony of the *ring* and *crozier*. In the first council which he assembled at *Rome*, he made no attempt, indeed, against *investitures*, nor did he aim at any thing farther than the abolition of *simony*, and the restoration of the sacerdotal and monastic orders to their ancient right of electing their respective bishops and abbots. But when he afterwards came to know that the affair of *investitures* was inseparably connected with the pretensions of the emperors, and indeed supposed them impowered to dispose of the higher ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, he was then persuaded that *simony* could not be extirpated as long as *investitures* were in being, and therefore to pluck up the evil by the root, he opposed the custom of *investitures* with the utmost vehemence. All this shews the true rise

Quicumque ergo his duobus aliquem initiant, procul dubio omnem pastorem auctoritatem hoc præsumendo sibi vendicant.

[i] HUMBERT mistook the spiritual signification of this holy *ring*, which was the emblem of a nuptial bond between the bishop and his see.

of the war that was carried on between the pontiff and the emperor with such bitterness and fury. CENT. XI.

And to understand still more clearly the merits of this cause it will be proper to observe, that it was not *investitures* considered in themselves that GREGORY opposed with such keenness and obstinacy, but that particular kind of *investitures*, which were in use at this time. He did not pretend to hinder the bishops from swearing allegiance to kings and emperors, nor even to become their *vassals*; and so far was he from prohibiting that kind of investiture that was performed by a verbal declaration or a written deed, that, on the contrary, he allowed the kings of *England* and *France* to *invest* in this manner, and probably consented to the use of the *scepter* in this ceremony, as did also after him CALLIXTUS II. But he could not bear the ceremony of *investiture* that was performed with the ensigns of the sacerdotal order, much less could he endure the performance of the ceremony before the solemn rite of consecration; but what rendered *investitures* most odious to this pontiff was their destroying entirely the free elections of bishops and abbots. It is now time to resume the thread of our history.

XV. The severe law that had been enacted against *investitures* by the influence and authority of GREGORY, made very little impression upon HENRY. He acknowledged, indeed, that in exposing ecclesiastical benefices to sale he had done amiss, and he promised amendment in that respect; but he remained inflexible against all attempts that were made to persuade him to resign his power of creating bishops and abbots, and the right of *investiture* which was intimately connected with this important privilege. Had this emperor been seconded by the German princes he might have maintained his refusal with dignity and success, but this was far from being the case; a considerable number of these princes, and among others the states of *Saxony*, were the secret or declared enemies of HENRY, and this furnished GREGORY with a favourable opportunity of extending his authority and executing his ambitious projects.

History of
the war that
was kindled
about invest-
itures.

CENT. XI.jects. This opportunity was by no means neglected; the imperious pontiff took occasion, from the discords that divided the empire, to insult and depress its chief; he sent, by his legates, an insolent message to the emperor at *Goslar*, ordering him to repair immediately to *Rome*, and clear himself, before the council that was to be assembled there, of the various crimes that were laid to his charge. The emperor, whose high spirit could not brook such arrogant treatment, was filled with the warmest indignation at the view of that insolent mandate, and, in the vehemence of his just resentment, assembled without delay a council of the German bishops at *Worms*, where **GREGORY** was charged with several flagitious practices, deposed from the pontificate of which he was declared unworthy, and an order issued out for the election of a new pontiff. **GREGORY** opposed violence to violence; for no sooner had he received by the letters and embassadors of **HENRY**, an account of the sentence that had been pronounced against him, than, in a raging fit of vindictive frenzy, he thundered his anathemas at the head of that prince, excluded him both from the communion of the church and from the throne of his ancestors, and impiously dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken to him as their lawful sovereign. Thus war was declared on both sides, and the civil and ecclesiastical powers were divided into two great factions, of which one maintained the rights of the emperor, while the other seconded the ambitious views of the pontiff. No terms were sufficient to express the complicated scenes of misery that arose from this deplorable schism.

XVI. At the entrance upon this war, the Swabian chiefs, with duke **RODOLPH** at their head, revolted against **HENRY**, and the Saxon princes, whose former quarrels with the emperor had been lately terminated by their defeat and submission [*k*], follow their example.

[(*k*) This same **RODOLPH** had, the year before this revolt, vanquished the Saxons, and obliged them to submit to the emperor. Besides the Swabian and Saxon chiefs, the dukes of *Bavaria* and *Carinthia*, the

ple. These united powers, being solicited by the pope to elect a new emperor, in case HENRY persisted in his obstinate obedience to the orders of the church, met at *Tribur* in the year 1076, to take council together concerning a matter of such high importance. The result of their deliberations was far from being favourable to the emperor; for they agreed, that the determination of the controversy between him and them should be referred to the Roman pontiff, who was to be invited for that purpose to a congress at *Augsburg* the year following, and that, in the mean time, HENRY should be suspended from his royal dignity, and live in the obscurity of a private station; to which rigorous conditions they also added, that he was to forfeit his kingdom, if, within the space of a year, he was not restored to the bosom of the church, and delivered from the anathema that lay upon his head. When things were come to this desperate extremity, and the faction, which was formed against this unfortunate prince, grew more formidable from day to day, his friends advised him to go into *Italy*, and implore in person the clemency of the pontiff. The emperor yielded to this ignominious counsel, without, however, obtaining from his voyage the advantages he expected. He passed the *Alps* amidst the rigour of a severe winter, arrived, in the month of February 1077, at the fortress of *Canusium*, where the *sanctimonious* pontiff resided at that time with the young MATHILDA, countess of *Tuscany*, the most powerful patroness of the church, and the most tender and affectionate of all the spiritual daughters of GREGORY. Here the suppliant prince, unmindful of his dignity, stood, during three days, in the open air at the entrance of this fortress, with his feet bare, his head uncovered, and with no other raiment but a wretched piece of coarse woollen cloth thrown over his body to cover his nakedness. The fourth day he was admitted to the presence of the lordly pontiff, who, with a good deal of difficulty, granted

the bishops of *Wurtzburg* and *Worms*, and several other eminent personages were concerned in this revolt.]

CENT. XI. him the absolution he demanded; but as to what regarded his restoration to the throne, he refused to determine that point before the approaching congress, at which he made HENRY promise to appear, forbidding him, at the same time to assume, during this interval, the title of king, as also to wear the ornaments, or to exercise the functions, of royalty. This opprobrious convention excited, and that justly, the indignation of the princes and bishops of *Italy*, who threatened HENRY with all sorts of evils, on account of his base and pusillanimous conduct, and would, undoubtedly, have deposed him, had not he diminished their resentment by violating the convention which he had been forced to enter into with the imperious pontiff, and resuming the title and other marks of royalty which he had been obliged to lay down. On the other hand, the confederate princes of *Swabia* and *Saxony* were no sooner informed of this unexpected change in the conduct of HENRY, than they assembled at *Forcheim* in the month of March A. D. 1077, and unanimously elected RODOLPH, duke of *Swabia*, emperor in his place [1].

XVII. This rash step kindled a terrible flame in *Germany* and *Italy*, and involved, for a long time, those unhappy lands in the calamities of war. In *Italy* the Normans, who were masters of the lower parts of that country, and the armies of the powerful and valiant MATHILDA maintained successfully the cause of GREGORY against the Lombards, who espoused the interests of HENRY; while this unfortunate prince, with all the forces he could assemble, carried on the war in *Germany* against RODOLPH and the confederate princes. GREGORY, considering the events of war as extremely doubt-

[1] The ancient and modern writers of Italian and German history have given ample relations of all these events, though not all with the same fidelity and accuracy. In the brief account I have given of these events, I have followed the genuine sources, and those writers whose testimonies are the most respectable and sure, such as SIGONIUS, PAGI, MURATORI, MASCOVIUS, NORIS, &c. who, though they differ in some minute circumstances, are yet agreed in those matters that are of the most importance.

ful, was at first afraid to declare for either side, and therefore observed, during a certain time, an appearance of neutrality; but encouraged by the battle of *Fladenheim*, in which HENRY was defeated by the Saxons A. D. 1080, he excommunicated anew that vanquished prince, and sending a crown to the victor RODOLPH, declared him lawful king of the Germans. The injured emperor did not let this new insult pass unpunished; seconded by the suffrages of several of the Italian and German bishops, he deposed GREGORY a second time in a council which met at *Mentz*, and, in a synod that was soon after assembled at *Brixen*, in the province of *Tirol*, he raised to the pontificate GUIBERT, archbishop of *Ravenna*, who assumed the title of CLEMENT III, when he was consecrated at *Rome* A. D. 1084, four years after his election.

XVIII. This election was followed soon after by an event which gave an advantageous turn to the affairs of HENRY; this event was a bloody battle fought upon the banks of the river *Elster*, where RODOLPH received a mortal wound, of which he died at *Mersburg*. The emperor, having got rid of this formidable enemy, marched directly into *Italy* the following year (1081) with a design to crush GREGORY and his adherents, whose defeat he imagined would contribute effectually to put an end to the troubles in *Germany*. Accordingly he made several campaigns, with various success, against the valiant troops of MATHILDA; and after having raised twice the siege of *Rome*, he resumed a third time that bold enterprize, and became, at length, master of the greatest part of that city in the year 1084. The first step that HENRY took after this success was to place GUIBERT in the papal chair, after which he received the imperial crown from the hands of the new pontiff, was saluted emperor by the Roman people, and laid close siege to the castle of *St. Angelo*, whither his mortal enemy, GREGORY, had fled for safety. He was, however, forced to raise this siege by the valour of ROBERT GUISCARD, duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, who brought GREGORY in triumph to *Rome*; but not think-

CENT. XI. ing him safe there, conducted him afterwards to *Salernum*. In this place the famous pontiff ended his days the year following A. D. 1085, and left *Europe* involved in those calamities which were the fatal effects of his boundless ambition. He was certainly a man of extensive abilities, endowed with a most enterprising genius, and an invincible firmness of mind; but it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that he was the most arrogant and audacious pontiff that had hitherto sat in the papal chair. The Roman church worships him as a saint, though it is certain that he was never placed in that order by a regular canonization. PAUL V, about the beginning of the xviith century, appointed the twenty fifth day of May, as a festival sacred to the memory of this pretended saint [m]; but the emperors of *Germany*, the kings of *France*, and other European princes have always opposed the celebration of this festival, and have thus effectually prevented its becoming universal. In our times BENEDICT XIII, zealous to secure to GREGORY the faintly honours, occasioned a contest, whose issue was by no means favourable to his superstitious views [n].

XIX. The death of GREGORY neither restored peace to the church, nor tranquillity to the state; the tumults and divisions which he had excited, still continued, and they were augmented from day to day by the same passions to which they owed their origin. CLEMENT III, who was the emperors pontiff [o], was master of the city of *Rome*, and was acknowledged as pope by a great part of *Italy*. HENRY carried on the war in *Germany*

[m] See the *Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. ad d. xxv. Maii*, and JO. MABIL-LON, *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. vi. part. II.*

[n] The reader will find an ample and curious account of this matter in a French book published in *Holland* in the year 1743, in three volumes, under the following title: *L'Avocat du Diable, ou Memoires Historiques et Critiques sur la vie et sur la Legende du Pape Gregoire VII.*

[o] The very learned JO. GOTTL. HORNIUS engaged himself, in the *Miscell. Lips.* tom. viii. p. 609. to publish the *Life of CLEMENT III.* This pontiff died in the year 1100, as appears evidently from the *Cbronicon Beneventanum*, published by MURATORI, in his *Antiquit. Italicar.* tom. i. p. 262. See also RUBER *Historia Ravennat.* lib. v. p. 307.

against the confederate princes. The faction of GREGORY, supported by the Normans, chose for his successor, in the year 1086, DIDIRICK, abbot of mount *Cassin*, who adopted the title of VICTOR III, and was consecrated in the church of St. PETER, in the year 1087, when that part of the city was recovered by the Normans from the dominion of CLEMENT. But this new pontiff was of a character quite opposite to that of GREGORY; he was modest and timorous, and also of a mild and gentle disposition; and finding the papal chair beset with factions, and the city of *Rome* under the dominion of his competitor, he retired to his monastery, where soon after he ended his days in peace. But before his abdication, he held a council at *Benevento*, where he confirmed and renewed the laws that GREGORY had enacted for the abolition of *investitures*.

XX. OTHO, bishop of *Ostia*, and monk of *Clugni*, was, by VICTOR's recommendation, chosen to succeed him. This new pontiff was elected at *Terracina* in the year 1088, and assumed the name of URBAN II. Inferior to GREGORY in fortitude and resolution, he was, however, his equal in arrogance and pride, and surpassed him greatly in temerity and imprudence [p]. The commencement of his pontificate had a fair aspect, and success seemed to smile upon his undertakings; but upon the emperor's return into *Italy* in the year 1090, the face of affairs was totally changed: victory crowned the arms of that prince, who, by redoubled efforts of valour, defeated, at length, GUELPH, duke of *Bavaria*, and the famous MATHILDA, who were the formidable heads of the papal faction. The abominable treachery of his son CONRAD, who, yielding to the seduction of his father's enemies, revolted against him, and, by the advice and assistance of URBAN and MATHILDA, usurp-

[p] We find in the *Posthumous Works of MABILLON*. tom. iii. p. i. the *Life of URBAN II*, composed by THEOD. RUINART, with much learning and industry, but with too little impartiality and fidelity, as we may naturally suppose even from the name of its author, since it is well known that no monkish writer dare attempt to paint the Roman pontiffs in their true colours.—See also for an account of URBAN the *Histoire Littér. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 514.

CENT. X. ed the kingdom of *Italy*, revived the drooping spirits of that faction, who hoped to see the laurels of the emperor blasted by his odious and unnatural rebellion. The consequences, however, of this event were less fatal to HENRY, than his enemies expected. In the mean time the troubles of *Italy*, still continued, nor could URBAN, with all his efforts, reduce the city of *Rome* under his lordly yoke. Finding all his ambitious measures disconcerted, he assembled a council at *Placentia* in the year 1095, where he confirmed the laws, and the anathemas of GREGORY; and afterwards undertook a journey into *France*, where he held the famous council of *Clermont*, and had the pleasure of kindling a new war against the infidel possessors of the holy land. In this council, instead of endeavouring to terminate the tumults and desolations that the dispute concerning *investitures* had already produced, this unworthy pontiff added fuel to the flame, and so exasperated matters by his imprudent and arrogant proceedings, as to render an accommodation between the contending parties more difficult than ever. GREGORY, notwithstanding his excessive arrogance and ambition, had never carried his insolence so far as to forbid the bishops and the rest of the clergy, to take the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns. This rebellious prohibition was reserved for the audacious arrogance of URBAN, who published it as a law, in the council of *Clermont* [q]. After this noble expedition, the restless pontiff returned into *Italy*, where he made himself master of the castle of *St. Angelo*, and soon after ended his days in the year 1099: he was not long survived by his antagonist CLEMENT III, who died the following year, and thus left RAYNIER, a Benedictine monk, who was chosen successor to URBAN, and assumed the

[q] To the xv. canon of this council of the following words were added: *Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligam fidelitatem faciant*, i. e. *It is enacted that no bishop or priest shall promise upon oath liege obedience to any king or any layman.* They are entirely mistaken, who affirm that GREGORY prohibited the bishops from taking oaths of allegiance to their respective sovereigns, as Cardinal NORIS has sufficiently demonstrated in his *Istoria delle Investiture*, chap. x. p. 279.

name

name of PASCHAL II, sole possessor of the papal chair at CENT. XI.
the conclusion of this century.

XXI. Among the eastern monks, in this century, there happened nothing worthy of being consigned to the records of history, while those of the west were concerned immediately in transactions of great consequence, and which deserve the attention of the curious reader. The western monks were remarkable for their attachment to the Roman pontiffs; this connexion had been long formed, and it was originally owing to the avarice and violence of both bishops and princes, who, under various pretexts, were constantly encroaching upon the possession of the monks, and thus obliged them to seek for security against these invasions of their property in the protection of the popes. This protection was readily granted by the pontiffs, who seized, with avidity, every occasion of enlarging their authority; and the monks, in return, engaged themselves to pay an annual tribute to their ghostly patrons. But in this century things were carried still farther, and the pontiffs, more especially GREGORY VII, who was eagerly bent upon humbling the bishops, and transferring their privileges to the Roman see, enlarged their jurisdiction over the monks at the expence of the episcopal order. They advised and exhorted the monks to withdraw themselves and their possessions from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and to place both under the inspection and dominion of St. PETER [r]. Hence it happened that from the time of GREGORY, the number of monasteries that had received *immunities* both from the temporal authority of the sovereign and the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops, were multiplied beyond measure throughout all *Europe*, and the rights of princes, together with the interests and privileges of the episcopal order, were violated and tram-

The state of
the monastic
orders.

[r] A specimen of this may be seen in the VII Epistle of GREGORY, in which he reduces the monks of *Redon* under the jurisdiction of the Roman see by a mandate, conceived in terms that had never been used before his time; see MARTENE *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. i. p. 204. We may add to this several like mandates of URBAN II and the succeeding pontiffs, which are to be found in the collection now cited, and in others of that kind.

pled

CENT. XI. pled upon, or rather engrossed to swell the growing despotism of the all grasping pontiffs [s].

Their corruption.

XXII. All the writers of this age complain of the ignorance, licentiousness, frauds, debaucheries, dissensions, and enormities that dishonoured by far the greatest part of the monastic orders, not to mention the numerous marks of their dissolution and impiety that have been handed down to our times [t]. However astonished we may be at such horrid irregularities among a set of men whose destination was so sacred, and whose profession was so austere, we shall still be more surprized to learn that this degenerate order, so far from losing ought of their influence and credit on account of their licentiousness, were promoted, on the contrary, to the highest ecclesiastical dignities, and beheld their opulence and authority increasing from day to day. Our surprize, indeed, will be diminished when we consider the gross ignorance and superstition, and the unbounded licentiousness and corruption of manners that reigned in this century among all ranks and orders of men [u]. Ignorance and corruption pervert the taste and judgment of even those who are not void of natural sagacity, and often prevent their being shocked at the greatest inconsistencies. Amidst this general depravation of sentiments and conduct, amidst the flagitious crimes that were daily perpetrated

[s] There is not, perhaps, in *Germany* one single instance of this pernicious immunity before the time of GREGORY VII.

[t] See JO. LAUNOY, *Affert. in privileg. S. Medardi*, cap. xxvi. § vi. Opp. tom. iii. part. II. p. 499. and SIMON *Biblioth. Critique*, tom. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 331.

[u] For an account of the astonishing corruption of this age, see BLONDEL *De formula, regnante Christo*, p. 14.—BOULAINVILLIERS *De l'Origine et des Droits de la Noblesse* in MOLET's *Memoires de litterature et d'Histoire*, tom. ix. part. I. p. 63. The corruption and violence that reigned with impunity in this horrid age gave occasion to the institutions of chivalry or knighthood, in consequence of which a certain set of equestrian heroes undertook the defence of the poor and feeble, and particularly of the fair-sex against the insults of powerful oppressors and ravishers. This order of knights errant was certainly of great use in these miserable times, when the majesty of laws and government was fallen into contempt, and they, who bore the title of sovereigns and magistrates, had neither resolution nor power to maintain their authority, or to perform the duties of their stations.

not

not only by the laity, but also by the various orders of CENT. XI. the clergy, both *secular*, and *regular*, all such as respected the common rules of decency, or preserved in their external demeanour the least appearance of piety and virtue, were looked upon as saints, of the highest rank, and considered as the peculiar favourites of heaven. This circumstance was, no doubt, favourable to many of the monks, who were less profligate than the rest of their order, and might contribute more or less to support the credit of the whole body. Besides, it often happened that princes, dukes, knights, and generals, whose days had been consumed in debauchery and crimes, and distinguished by nothing but the violent exploits of unbridled lust, cruelty, and avarice, felt at the approach of old age, or death, the inexpressible anguish of a wounded conscience, and the gloomy apprehensions and terrors it excites. In this dreadful condition, what was their resource? what were the means by which they hoped to disarm the uplifted hand of divine justice, and render the governour of the world propitious? They purchased at an enormous price the prayers of the monks to screen them from judgment, and devoted to God and to the saints a large portion of the fruits of their rapine, or entered themselves into the monastic order, and bequeathed their possessions to their new brethren. And thus it was that monkery received perpetually new accessions of opulence and credit.

XXIII. The monks of *Clugni* in *France* surpassed all the other religious orders in the renown they had acquired from a prevailing opinion of their eminent sanctity and virtue. Hence their discipline was universally respected, and hence also their rules were adopted by the founders of new monasteries, and the reformers of those that were in a state of decline. These famous monks arose, by degrees, to the very highest summit of worldly prosperity, by the presents which they received from all quarters; and their power and credit grew, with their opulence, to such a height, that, towards the conclusion of this century, they were formed into a separate society, which still subsists under the title of the *order*, or *congregation*

The monks
of *Clugni*.

CENT. XI. congregation of *Clugni* [w]. And no sooner were they thus established than they extended their spiritual dominion on all sides, reducing, under their jurisdiction, all the monasteries which they had reformed by their counsels, and engaged to adopt their religious discipline. The famous *HUGO*, sixth abbot of *Clugni*, who was in high credit at the court of *Rome*, and had acquired the peculiar protection and esteem of several princes, laboured, with such success, in extending the power and jurisdiction of his order, that, before the end of this century, he saw himself at the head of five and thirty of the principal monasteries in *France*, besides a considerable number of smaller convents that acknowledged him as their chief. Many other religious societies, though they refused entering into this new order, and continued to chuse their respective governors, yet shewed such respect for the abbot of *Clugni*, or the arch-abbot, as he styled himself, that they regarded him as their spiritual chief [x]. This enormous augmentation of opulence and authority was, however, fruitful of many evils; it increased the arrogance of these aspiring monks, and contributed much to the propagation of the several vices, that dishonoured the religious societies of this licentious and superstitious age. The monks of *Clugni* degenerated soon from their primitive sanctity, and, in a short space of time, were distinguished by nothing but the peculiarities of their discipline from the rest of the monastic orders.

XXIV. The example of these monks excited several pious men to erect particular monastic fraternities, or congregations like that of *Clugni*; the consequence of which was that the Benedictine order, which had been hitherto one great and universal body, was now divided into

[w] For a particular account of the rapid and monstrous strides, which the order of *Clugni* made to opulence and dominion, see *STEPH. BALUZIUS Miscellan.* tom. v. p. 343. and tom. vi. p. 436. as also *MABILLON, Annal. Bened.* tom. v. *passim*.

[x] *MABILLON Præfat. ad Sæc. v. Act. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. xxvi.—*Hist. Générale de Bourgogne par les Moines Benedictins*, tom. i. p. 151. published at *Paris* in folio, in the year 1739.—*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 470.

into separate societies, which, though they were subject CENT. XI. to one general rule, yet differed from each other in various circumstances both of their discipline and manner of living, and rendered their division still more conspicuous by reciprocal exertions of animosity and hatred. In the year 1023, ROMUALD, an Italian fanatic, retired to *Camaldoli* [y], on the mount *Appennine*, and, in that solitary retreat, founded the order, or congregation of the *Camoldelites*, which still remains in a flourishing state particularly in *Italy*. His followers were distinguished into two classes, of which the one were Cœnobites, and the other Eremites. Both observed a severe discipline; but the Cœnobites had degenerated much from their primitive austerity [z].

Some time after this, GUALBERT, a native of *Florence*, founded at *Val-Ombroso*, situated in the *Appennines*, a congregation of Benedictine monks, who, in a short space of time, propagated their discipline in several parts of *Italy* [a]. To these two Italian monasteries we may add that of *Hirsauge* in *Germany* [b], erected by WILLIAM, an eminent abbot, who had reformed many ancient convents, and was the founder of several new establishments. It is, however, to be observed, that the monastery of *Hirsauge* was rather a branch of

[y] Otherwise called *Kampo-Malduli*.

[z] The writers, who have given any satisfactory accounts of the order of the *Kamaldolites*, are enumerated by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 895. Add to these ROMUALDI VITA in *Actis Sanctior. Februar.* tom. iii. p. 101. and in MABILLON'S *Acta Sanctior. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. vi.* part. i. p. 247.—HELYOT *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 236.—MABILLON *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 261.—MAGNOALDI ZEIGELBAVER. *Centifolium Camaldulense, sive Notitia Scriptor. Camaldulensium*, published at *Venice* in the year 1750.

[a] See the life of GUALBERT in MABILLON'S *Acta Sanctior. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. vi.* part. II. p. 273.—HELYOT *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 298. Many interesting circumstances relating to the history of this order have been published by the learned LAMI, in the *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, published at *Florence*, tom. ii. p. 238. as also p. 272. 279, where the ancient laws of the order are enumerated; see also tom. iii. of the same work, p. 177. 212.

[b] See MABILLON *Acta Sanctiorum Benedict. Sæc. vi.* part. II. p. 716.—HELYOT *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 332.

CENT. XI. the congregation of *Clugni* whose laws and manner of living it had adopted, than a new fraternity.

Cistercian
monks.

XXV. Towards the conclusion of this century [c], ROBERT, abbot of *Moleme* in *Burgundy*, having employed, in vain, his most zealous efforts to revive the decaying piety and discipline of his convent, and to oblige his monks to observe, with more exactness, the rule of St. BENEDICT, retired, with about twenty monks, who had not been infected with the dissolute turn of their brethren, to a place called *Citeaux*, in the diocese of *Chalons*. In this retreat, which was at that time a miserable desert, covered on all sides with brambles and thorns, but which bears, at present, a quite different aspect, ROBERT laid the foundations of the famous order, or congregation of *Cistercians*, which like that of *Clugni*, made a most rapid and astonishing progress, was propagated through the greatest part of *Europe* in the following century, and was not only enriched with the most liberal and splendid donations, but also acquired the form and privileges of a spiritual republic, and exercised a sort of dominion over all the monastic orders [d]. The great and fundamental law of this new fraternity was the rule of St. BENEDICT, which was to be solemnly and rigorously observed; to this were added several other institutions and injunctions, which were designed to maintain the authority of this rule, to ensure its observance, and to defend it against the dangerous effects of opulence, and the restless efforts of human corruption to render the best establishments imperfect. These injunctions were excessively austere, grievous to nature but pious and laudable in the esteem of a superstitious age. They did not, however, secure the sanctity of this holy congregation, since the seducing charms of opulence, that corrupted the monks of *Clugni* much sooner than was expected, produced the same effect among the *Cistercians*, whose zeal, in the rigorous ob-

[c] In the year 1098.

[(d) In about an hundred years after its first establishment, this order boasted of 1800 abbeys, and was become so powerful, that it governed almost all *Europe*, both in spirituals and temporals.]

servance

servance of their rule, began gradually to diminish, and CENT. XI.
 who, in process of time, grew as negligent and dissolute
 as the rest of the Benedictines [e].

XXVI. Besides these convents that were founded up- New mo-
nastic orders.
 on the principles, and might be considered as branches
 of the Benedictine order, several other monastic socie-
 ties were formed, which were distinguished by peculiar
 laws, and by rules of discipline and obedience, which
 they had drawn up for themselves. To many of those
 gloomy and fanatical monks, whose austerity was ra-
 ther the fruit of a bad habit of body, than the result of
 a religious principle, the rule of BENEDICT appeared too
 mild; to others it seemed incomplete and defective, and
 not sufficiently accommodated to the exercise of the va-
 rious duties we owe to the supreme Being. Hence STE-
 PHEN, a nobleman of *Auvergne* (who is called by some
 STEPHEN *de Muret*, from the place where he first erect-
 ed the convent of his order) obtained, in the year 1073,
 from GREGORY VII, the privilege of instituting a new
 species of monastic discipline. His first design was to
 subject his fraternity to the rule of St. BENEDICT, but he
 changed his intention, and composed, himself, the body
 of laws, which was to be their rule of life, piety, and
 manners. In these laws there were many injunctions
 that shewed the excessive austerity of their author.
 Poverty and obedience were the two great points which
 he inculcated with the warmest zeal, and all his regula-
 tions were directed to promote and secure them in this
 new establishment; for this purpose it was solemnly en-
 acted, that the monks should possess no lands beyond

[e] The principle historian of the *Cistercian Order* is ANG. MANRI-
 QUES, whose *Annales Cistercienses*, an ample and learned work, were
 published in four volumes, folio, at *Lyons*, in the year 1642. After
 him we may place PIERRE LE NAIN, whose *Essai de l'Histoire de l'Or-
 dre des Citeaux*, was printed in the year 1696, at *Paris*, in nine vo-
 lumes in 8vo. The other historians, who have given accounts of this
 famous order, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latina
 medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1066. Add to these HELYOT's *Histoire des Or-
 dres*, tom. v. p. 341, and MABILLON, who, in the fifth and sixth
 volumes of his *Annales Benedictini*, has given a learned and accurate ac-
 count of the origin and progress of the Cistercians.

CENT. XI. the limits of their convent; that the use of flesh should be allowed to none, not even to the sick and infirm; and that none should be permitted to keep cattle, that they might not be exposed to the temptation of violating their frugal regimen. To these severe precepts many others of equal rigour were added: for this gloomy legislator imposed upon his fraternity the solemn observance of a profound and uninterrupted silence, and insisted so much upon the importance and necessity of solitude, that none but a few persons of the highest eminence and authority were permitted to pass the threshold of his monastery. He prohibited all intercourse with the sex, and indeed excluded his order from all the comforts and enjoyments of life. His followers were divided into two classes, of which the one comprehended the *clerks*, and the other, what he called, the *converted brethren*. The former were totally absorbed in the contemplation of divine things, while the latter were charged with the care and administration of what ever related to the concerns and necessities of a present life. Such were the principal circumstances of the new institution founded by STEPHEN, which arose to the highest pitch of renown in this and the following century, and was regarded with the most profound veneration as long as its laws and discipline were observed; but two things contributed to its decline, and at length brought on its ruin; the first was, the violent contest which arose between the *clerks* and the *converts*, on account of the pre-eminence which the latter pretended over the former; and the second was, the gradual diminution of the rigour and austerity of STEPHEN'S rule, which was softened and mitigated from time to time, both by the heads of the order, and by the Roman pontiffs. This once famous monastic society was distinguished by the title of the *Order of Grandmontains*, as *Muret*, where they were first established, was situated near *Grammont*, in the province of *Limoges* [f].

XXVII. In

[f] The origin of this order is related by BERNARD GUIDON, whose treatise upon that subject is published in the *Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum*

XXVII. In the year 1084 [g], was instituted the famous order of Carthusians, so called from *Chartreux*, a dismal and wild spot of ground near *Grenoble* in *Dauphine*, surrounded with barren mountains and craggy rocks. The founder of this monastic society, which surpassed all the rest in the extravagant austerity of their manners and discipline, was BRUNO, a native of *Cologne*, and canon of the cathedral of *Rheims* in *France*. This zealous ecclesiastic, who had neither power to reform, nor patience to bear the dissolute manners of his archbishop MANASSE, retired from his church with six of his companions, and, having obtained the permission of HUGH, bishop of *Grenoble*, fixed his residence in the miserable desert already mentioned [h]. He adopted at first

CENT.XI.

The order
of the Car-
thusians.

torum PHIL. LABBEI, tom. ii. p. 275. For an account of the history of this celebrated society, see JO. MABILLON *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. p. 65. f. p. 99. tom. vi. p. 116. and *Præf. ad Actor. SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part. II. p. 34.—HELYOT *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 409.—*Gallia Christiana Monachor. Benedict.* tom. ii. p. 645.—BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionens.* tom. i. p. 158. et *Miscellanea*, tom. vii. p. 486.—[The life and ghostly exploits of STEPHEN, the founder of this order, are recorded in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Februarii*, p. 199.]

[g] Some place the institution of this order in the year 1080, and others in the year 1086.

[h] The learned FABRICIUS mentions, in his *Biblioth. Latina mediævi*, tom. ii. p. 784. several writers who have composed the history of BRUNO and his order, but his enumeration is incomplete; since there are yet extant many histories of the Carthusians, that have escaped his notice. See INNOCENT. MASSONI *Annales Carthusian.* published in the year 1687.—PETRI ORLANDI *Chronicon Carthusianum*, and the elegant, though imperfect history of the order in question, which is to be found in HELYOT's *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 366. Many important illustrations on the nature and laws of this famous society have been published by MABILLON, in his *Annales Benedictini*, tom. vi. p. 638. 683. A particular and accurate account of BRUNO has been given by the Benedictine monks, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 233. but a yet more ample one will be undoubtedly given by the compilers of the *Acta Sanctorum*, when they shall have carried on their work to the 6th of October, which is the festival consecrated to the memory of BRUNO. It was a current report in ancient times, that the occasion of BRUNO's retreat was the miraculous restoration of a certain priest to life, who, while the funeral service was performing, raised himself up and said *By the just judgment of God I am demanded*, and then expired. This story is looked upon as fabulous by the most respectable

CENT. XI. first the rule of St. BENEDICT, to which he added a considerable number of severe and rigorous precepts; his successors, however, went still farther, and imposed upon the Carthusians new laws, much more intolerable than those of their founder, laws which inculcated the highest degrees of austerity that the most gloomy imagination could invent [i]. And yet, notwithstanding all this, it is remarkable, that no monastic society degenerated so little from the severity of their primitive institution and discipline as this of the Carthusians. The progress of their order was indeed less rapid, and their influence less extensive in the different countries of *Europe*, than the progress and influence of those monastic establishments, whose laws were less rigorous, and whose manners were less austere. It was a long time before the tender sex could be engaged to submit to the savage rules of this melancholy institution; nor had the Carthusian order ever reason to boast of a multitude of females subjected to its jurisdiction; it was too forbidding to captivate a sex, which, though susceptible of the seductions of enthusiasm, is of a frame too delicate to support the severities of a rigorous self-denial [k].

XXVIII. To

ble writers even of the Roman church, especially since it has been refuted by LAUNOY, in his treatise *De causa Secessus Brunonis in Desertum*. Nor does it seem to preserve its credit among the Carthusians, who are more interested than others in this pretended miracle. Such of them, at least, as affirm it, do it with a good deal of modesty and diffidence. The arguments on both sides are candidly and accurately enumerated by CÆS. EGASS. DU BOULAY, in his *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. i. p. 467.

[i] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. vi.* part. II. *Ador. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. 37.

[k] The Carthusian nuns have not sufficiently attracted the attention of the authors who have written concerning this famous order; nay, several writers have gone so far as to maintain, that there was not in this order a single convent of nuns. This notion, however, is highly erroneous; as there were formerly several convents of Carthusian virgins, of which indeed the greatest part have not subsisted to our times. In the year 1368, there was an extraordinary law passed, by which the establishment of any more female Carthusian convents was expressly prohibited. Hence there remain only five at this day; four in *France*, and one at *Bruges* in *Flanders*. See the *Variétés Historiques Physiques et Littéraires*,

XXVIII. Towards the conclusion of this century [1], CENT. XI. the order of St. ANTHONY of *Vienne* in *Dauphine*, was instituted for the relief and support of such as were seized with grievous disorders, and particularly with the disease called *St. Anthony's fire*. All who were infected with that pestilential disorder repaired to a cell built near *Vienne* by the Benedictine monks of *Grammont*, in which the body of St. ANTHONY was said to repose, that, by the prayers and intercession of this eminent saint, they might be miraculously healed. GASTON, an opulent nobleman of *Vienne*, and his son GUERIN, pretended to have experienced in their complete recovery the marvellous efficacy of St. ANTHONY's intercession, and, in consequence thereof, devoted themselves and their possessions, from a principle of pious gratitude, to the service of St. ANTHONY, and to the performance of generous and charitable offices towards all such as were afflicted with the miseries of poverty and sickness. Their example was followed, at first, but by eight persons; their community, however, was afterwards considerably augmented. They were not bound by particular vows like the other monastic orders, but were consecrated, in general, to the service of God, and lived under the jurisdiction of the monks of *Grammont*. In process of time, growing opulent and powerful by the multitude of pious donations they received from all parts, they withdrew themselves from the dominion of the Benedictines, propagated their order in various countries, and, at length, obtained, in the year 1297, from BONIFACE VIII, the dignity and privileges of an independant congregation, under the rule of St. AUGUSTIN [m].

The order of
St. Anthony
of *Vienne*.

XXIX. The

Carthusians, tom. i. p. 80. published at *Paris*. in 8vo in the year 1752. Certain it is, that the rigorous discipline of the Carthusians is quite inconsistent with the delicacy and tenderness of the female sex; and therefore in the few female convents of that order that still subsist the austerity of that discipline has been diminished, as well from necessity, as from humanity and wisdom; it was more particularly found necessary to abrogate those severe injunctions of *silence* and *solitude*, that are so little adapted to the known character and genius of the sex.

[1] In the year 1095.

[m] See the *Acta Sanctorum*. tom. ii. *Januarii*, p. 160.—HELYOT,
T 3 *Histoire*

XXIX. The licentiousness and corruption, that had infected all the other ranks and orders of the clergy, was also remarkable among the *canons*, which was a middle sort of order between the monks and secular priests, and whose first establishment was in the VIIIth century. In certain provinces of *Europe* the *canons* were corrupted to a very high degree, and surpassed, in the scandalous dissolution of their manners, all the other ecclesiastical and monastic orders. Hence several pious and virtuous persons exerted their zeal for the reformation of this degenerate body; some pontiffs appeared in this good cause, and more especially NICOLAS II, who, in a council held at *Rome* in the year 1059, abrogated the ancient rule of the canons, which had been drawn up at *Aix la-Chapelle*, and substituted another in its place [n]. These laudable attempts were attended with considerable success, and a much better rule of discipline was established in almost all the canonical orders, than that which had been formerly in use. It was not, however, possible to regulate them all upon the same footing, and to subject them to the same degree of reformation and discipline; nor indeed was this necessary. Accordingly a certain number of these canonical colleges were erected into communities, the respective members of which had one common dwelling, and a common table, which was the point chiefly insisted upon by the pontiffs, as this alone was sufficient to prevent the *canons* from entering into the bonds of matrimony. It did not, however, exclude them from the possession or enjoyment of private property; for they reserved to themselves the right of

Histoire des Ordres, tom. ii. p. 108.—GARR. PENOTT. *Historia Canonicorum regular.* lib. ii. c. 70.—JO. ERH. KAPPII *Diff. de fratribus S. Antonii.* published at *Leipsick* in the year 1737.—For an account of the present state of the principle hospital or residence of this order, where the abbot remains, see MARTENE and DURAND *Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins de la Congreg. de St. Maur.* tom. i. p. 260.

[n] This decree of NICOLAS II, by which the primitive rule of the *canons* was changed, is published by MABILLON among the papers, which serve as proofs to the 4th volume of his *Annales Benedictini*, and also in the *Annals* themselves. See tom. iv. *Annal. Bened.* p. 748. as also lib. lxi. § xxxv. p. 586.

appro-

appropriating to their own use the fruits and revenues CENT. XI. of their benefices, and of employing them, as they thought expedient. Other canonical congregations subjected themselves to a rule of life less agreeable and commodious, in consequence of the zealous exhortations of Ivo, or IVES bishop of *Chartres*, renouncing all their worldly possessions and prospects, all private property, and living in a manner that resembled the austerity of the monastic orders. Hence arose the well known distinction between the *secular* and the *regular canons*; the former of which observed the decree of NICOLAS II, while the latter, more prone to mortification and self-denial, complied with the directions and jurisdictions of Ivo; and as this austere prelate imitated St. AUGUSTIN [o] in the manner of regulating the conduct of his clergy, his *canons* were called, by many, the *regular canons of St. Augustin* [p].

XXX. The

[o] St. AUGUSTIN committed to writing no particular rule for his clergy; but his manner of ruling them may be learned from several passages in his *Epistles*.]

[p] See MABILLON *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. iv. p. 586. et *Opera Posthuma*, tom. ii. p. 102. 115.—HELYOT *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 11.—LUD. THOMASSINI *Disciplina Ecclesiæ circa Beneficia*, tom. i. part. I. lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 657.—MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 257.—In the *Gallia Christiana* of the Benedictine monks, we find frequent mention made both of this reformation of the *canons*, and also of their division into *seculars* and *regulars*. The *regular canons* are much displeased with all the accounts, that render the origin of their community so recent; they are extremely ambitious of appearing with the venerable character of an ancient establishment, and therefore trace back their first rise through the darkness of the remotest ages, to CHRIST himself, or at least to St. AUGUSTIN. But the arguments and testimonies, by which they pretend to support this imagined antiquity of their order, are a proof of the weakness of their cause and of the vanity of their pretensions, and are not, therefore, worthy of a serious refutation. It is true, the title of *canons* is, undoubtedly, of much more ancient date, than the xth century, but not as applied to a particular order or institution, for at its first rise it was used in a very vague general sense (see CLAUD. DE VERT *Explications des Ceremonies de la Messe*, tom. i. p. 58.) and therefore the mere existence of the title proves nothing. At the same time, it is evident beyond all possibility of contradiction, that we find not the least mention made of the division of the *canons* into *regular* and *secular* before the xth century. And it is

CENT. XI.

The principal Greek writers.

XXX. The most eminent of the Greek writers of this century, were,

THEOPHANES *Cerameus*, i. e. the *potter*, of whom there is yet extant a volume of *Homilies*, that are not altogether contemptible;

NILUS DOXOPATRIUS, who was remarkable for his knowledge in matters relating to ecclesiastical polity;

NICETAS PECTORATUS, who was a most strenuous defender of the religious sentiments and customs of the Greek church;

MICHAEL PSELLUS, whose vast progress in various kinds of learning and science procured him a most distinguished and shining reputation;

MICHAEL CERULARIUS, bishop or patriarch of *Constantinople*, who imprudently revived the controversy between the Greeks and Latins, which had been for some time happily suspended;

SIMEON, the Younger, author of a book of *Meditations on the Duties of the Christian life*, which is yet extant;

THEOPHYLACT, a Bulgarian; whose illustrations of

equally certain, that those *canons*, who had nothing in common but their *dwelling* and *table*, were called *secular*; while those who had divested themselves of all private property, and had every thing, without exception, in common with their fraternity, were distinguished by the title of *regular canons*.

[(p) To Dr. MOSHEIM's account of the *canons*, it may not be improper to add a few words concerning their introduction into *England*, and their progress and establishment among us. The order of the *regular canons* of *St. Augustin* was brought into *England* by ADELWALD, confessor to HENRY I, who first erected a priory of his order at *Nostel* in *Yorkshire*, and had influence enough to have the church of *Carlisle* converted into an episcopal see, and given to regular canons invested with the privilege of choosing their bishop. This order was singularly favoured and protected by HENRY I, who gave them, in the year 1107, the priory of *Dunstable*, and by queen MAUD, who erected for them, the year following, the priory of the *Holy Trinity* in *London*, the priory of which was always one of the twenty-four aldermen. They increased so prodigiously, that, besides the noble priory of *Merton*, which was founded for them, in the year 1117, by GILBERT, an earl of the Norman blood, they had, under the reign of EDWARD I, fifty-three priories, as appears by the catalogue presented to that prince, when he obliged all the monasteries to receive his protection and to acknowledge his jurisdiction.]

the

the sacred writings were received with universal approbation and esteem [q]. CENT. XI.

XXXI. The writers who distinguished themselves most among the Latins, were they that follow: Latin writers.

FULBERT, bishop of *Chartres*, eminent for his love of letters, and his zeal for the education of youth, as also for various compositions, particularly his epistles, and famous for his excessive and enthusiastic attachment to the Virgin MARY [r];

HUMBERT, a Cardinal of the Roman church, who far surpassed all the Latins, both in the vehemence and learning which appeared in his controversial writings against the Greeks [s];

PETRUS DAMIANUS, who, on account of his genius, candor, probity, and various erudition, deserves to be ranked among the most learned and estimable writers of this century; though he was not altogether untainted with the reigning prejudices and defects of the times [t];

MARIANUS SCOTUS, whose *Chronicle*, with several other compositions is yet extant;

ANSELM, archbishop of *Canterbury*, a man of great genius and subtilty, deeply versed in the dialectic of this age, and most illustriously distinguished by his profound and extraordinary knowledge in theology [u];

LANFRANC, also archbishop of *Canterbury*, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his *Commentary upon the*

[q] For a more particular account of these Greek writers, the reader may consult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

[r] For a further account of this eminent man, see the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 261.

[s] See MARTENE *Tesaurus Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 629.—*Histoire Litt. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 527.

[t] See the *Acta Sanctor.* Febr. tom. iii. p. 406.—*General Dictionary*, at the article DAMIEN.—CASIM. OUDINI *Diff. in* tom. ii. *Comm. de Scriptor. Eccles.* p. 686.

[u] See the *Histoire Litt. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 398.—RAPIN THOYRAS *Hist. d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. p. 65. 166. *de l'ed. en 4to.*—COLONIA *Histoire Litt. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 210.—We have already given a more ample account of the eminent abilities and learned productions of ANSELM.

CENT. XI. *Epistles of St. PAUL*, as also by several other productions [w], which, considering the age in which he lived, discover an uncommon measure of sagacity and erudition [x];

BRUNO of mount *Cassin*, and the other famous ecclesiastic of that name, who founded the monastery of the Carthusians;

Ivo, bishop of *Chartres*, who was so eminently distinguished by his zeal and activity in maintaining the rights and privileges of the church;

HILDEBERT, archbishop of *Tours*, who was a philosopher, and a poet as well as a divine, without being either eminent or contemptible in any of these characters [y]; but, upon the whole, a man of considerable learning and capacity;

GREGORY VII, that imperious and arrogant pontiff, of whom we have several productions, besides his *Letters*.

C H A P. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church in this century.

The state of I.
religion.

IT is not necessary to draw at full length the hideous portrait of the religion of this age. It may easily be imagined, that its features were full of deformity, when we consider that its gaurdians were equally

[(w) Among these productions, we may reckon on LANFRANC's *Letters* to pope ALEXANDER II, to HILDEBRAND, while archdeacon of *Rome*, and to several bishops in *England* and *Normandy*; as also *A Commentary upon the Psalms*; *A treatise concerning Confession*; *An Ecclesiastical History*, which is not extant; and *A remarkable Dissertation concerning the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist*. In this last performance, LANCFRANC endeavours to prove against BERENGER the reality of a corporal presence in the eucharist; though it is manifest, that this opinion was not the doctrine of the church of *England* in the conclusion of the tenth, or the commencement of the following century. See COLLIER's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, vol. i. p. 260. 263.]

[x] *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 260.

[y] The Benedictine monks published, in folio, at *Paris*, in the year 1708, the *Works* of HILDEBERT, illustrated by the observations of BEAUGENDRE.

desti-

destitute of knowledge and virtue, and that the heads CONT. XI.
 and rulers of the Christian church, instead of exhibiting
 models of piety, held forth in their conduct scandalous
 examples of the most flagitious crimes. The people
 were sunk in the grossest superstition, and employed all
 their zeal in the worship of images and relics, and in the
 performance of a trifling round of ceremonies, which
 were imposed upon them by the tyranny of a des-
 potic priesthood. The more learned, 'tis true, retain-
 ed still some notions of the truth, which, however,
 they obscured and corrupted by a wretched mixture of
 opinions and precepts, of which some were ludicrous,
 others pernicious, and the most of them equally desti-
 tute of truth and utility. There were, no doubt, in se-
 veral places, judicious and pious men, who would have
 willingly lent a supporting hand to the declining cause
 of true religion; but the violent prejudices of a barbar-
 ous age rendered all such attempts not only dangerous,
 but even desperate; and those chosen spirits, who had
 escaped the general contagion, lay too much concealed.
 and had therefore too little influence to combat, with
 success, the formidable patrons of impiety and supersti-
 tion, who were extremely numerous, in all ranks and
 orders, from the throne to the cottage.

II. Notwithstanding all this, we find, from the time
 of GREGORY VII, several proofs of the zealous efforts of
 those, who are generally called, by the protestants, the
witnesses of the truth; by whom are meant, such pious
 and judicious Christians, as adhered to the pure religion
 of the gospel, and remained uncorrupted amidst the
 growth of superstition; who deplored the miserable state
 to which Christianity was reduced by the alteration of
 its divine doctrines, and the vices of its profligate mini-
 sters; who opposed, with rigour, the tyrannic ambition
 both of the lordly pontiff and the aspiring bishops; and
 in some provinces privately, in others openly, attempt-
 ed the reformation of a corrupt and idolatrous church,
 and of a barbarous and superstitious age. This was,
 indeed, bearing witness to the truth in the noblest man-
 ner,

CENT. XI. ner, and it was principally in *Italy* and *France* that the marks of this heroic piety were exhibited. [Nor is it at all surprizing, that the reigning superstition of the times met with this opposition; it is astonishing, on the contrary, that this opposition was not much greater and more universal, and that millions of Christians suffered themselves to be hood-winked with such a tame submission, and closed their eyes upon the light with so little reluctance.] For notwithstanding the darkness of the times, and the general ignorance of the true religion that prevailed in all ranks and orders, yet the very fragments of the gospel (if we may use that term) which were still read and explained to the people, were sufficient, at least, to convince the most stupid and illiterate, that the religion, which was now imposed upon them, was not the true religion of JESUS; that the discourses, the lives and morals of the clergy were directly opposite to what the divine Saviour required of his disciples, and to the rules he had laid down for the direction of their conduct; that the pontiffs and bishops abused, in a scandalous manner, their power and opulence; and that the favour of God, and the salvation exhibited in his blessed gospel, were not to be obtained by performing a round of external ceremonies, by pompous donations to churches and priests, or by founding and enriching monasteries, but by real sanctity of heart and manners.

III. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that they who undertook, with such such zeal and ardour, the reformation of the church were not, for the most part, equal to this arduous and important enterprize, and that by avoiding, with more vehemence than circumspection, certain abuses and defects, they rushed unhappily into the opposite extremes. They all perceived the abominable nature of those inventions with which superstition had disfigured the religion of JESUS; but they had also lost sight of the true nature and genius of that celestial religion, that lay thus disfigured in the hands of a superstitious and dissolute priesthood. They were shocked at the absurdities of the established worship; but few of

of them were sufficiently acquainted with the sublime CENT. XI. precepts and doctrines of genuine Christianity, to substitute in the place of this superstitious worship a rational service. Hence their attempts of reformation, even where they were successful, were extremely imperfect, and produced little more than a motley mixture of truth and falshood, of wisdom and indiscretion; of which we might alledge a multitude of examples. Observing for instance, that the corruption and licentiousness of the clergy were, in a great measure, occasioned by their excessive opulence, and their vast possessions, they conceived rashly the highest ideas of the salutary effects of indigence, and looked upon voluntary poverty as the most eminent and illustrious virtue of a Christian minister. They had also formed to themselves a notion, that the primitive church was to be the standing and perpetual model, according to which the rites, government, and worship of all Christian churches were to be regulated in all the ages of the world, and that the lives and manners of the holy apostles were to be rigorously followed, in every respect by all the ministers of CHRIST. [These notions which were injudiciously taken up, and blindly entertained (without any regard to the difference of times, places, circumstances, and characters; without considering that the provident wisdom of CHRIST and his apostles left many regulations to the prudence and piety of the governours of the church) were productive of many pernicious effects, and threw these good reformers, whose zeal was not always according to knowledge, from the extreme of superstition into the extreme of enthusiasm.] Many, well meaning persons, whose intentions were highly laudable, fell into great errors in consequence of these ill-grounded notions. Justly incensed at the conduct of the superstitious multitude, who placed the whole of religion in external services, and hoped to secure their salvation by the performance of a laborious round of unmeaning rites and ceremonies, they rashly maintained that true piety was to be confined entirely to the inward motions and affections of the soul, and to the contemplation of spiritual and divine things.

In

CENT. XI. In consequence of this specious yet erroneous principle, they treated with the utmost contempt all the external parts of religious worship, and aimed at nothing less than the total suppression of sacraments, churches, religious assemblies of every kind, and Christian ministers of every order.

Commentators and expositors.

IV. Several of both the Greek and Latin writers employed their learned and pious labours in the exposition and illustration of the holy scriptures. Among the Latins, BRUNO wrote a commentary on the *Book of Psalms*, LANFRANC upon the *Epistles of St. Paul*, BERENGER upon the *Revelations of St. John*, GREGORY VII upon the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, and others upon other parts of the sacred writings. But all these expositors, in compliance with the prevailing custom of the times, either copied the explications of the ancient commentators, or made such whimsical applications of certain passages of scripture, both in explaining the doctrines and inculcating the duties of religion, that it is often difficult to peruse them without indignation or disgust. The most eminent of the Grecian expositors was THEOPHYLACT, a native of *Bulgaria*; though he also is indebted to the ancients, and, in a particular manner, to St. CHRYSOSTOM, for the greatest part of his most judicious observations [z]. Nor must we pass in silence the commentary upon the *Book of Psalms*, and the *Song of Solomon*, that was composed by the learned MICHAEL PSELLUS; nor the *Chain* of commentaries upon the *Book of Job*, which we owe to the industry of NICETAS.

The scholastic theology.

V. All the Latin doctors, if we except a few Hibernian divines, who blended with the beautiful simplicity of the gospel the perplexing subtilties of an obscure philosophy, had hitherto derived their system of religion, and their explications of divine truth, either from the holy scriptures alone, or from these sacred oracles explained

[z] For an account of THEOPHYLACT, see RICH. SIMON *Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* ch. xxviii. p. 390. & *Critique de la Bibliotheque des auteurs Ecclesiastiques, par Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 310. where he also speaks largely concerning NICETAS and OECUMENIUS.

plained by the illustrations, and compared with the theology of the ancient doctors. But in this century certain writers, and among others, the famous BERENGER [a], went much farther, and employed the rules of logic and the subtilties of metaphysical discussions, both in explaining the doctrines of scripture, and in proving the truth of their own particular opinions. Hence LANFRANC, the antagonist of BERENGER, and afterwards archbishop of *Canterbury*, introduced into the field of religious controversy the same philosophical arms, and seemed, in general, desirous of employing the dictates of reason to illustrate and confirm the truths of religion. His example, in this respect, was followed by ANSELM, his disciple and successor in the see of *Canterbury*, a man of a truly metaphysical genius, and capable of giving the greatest air of dignity and importance to the *first philosophy*. Such were the beginnings of that philosophical theology, which grew afterwards, by degrees, into a cloudy and enormous system, and, from the public schools in which it was cultivated, acquired the name of *scholastic divinity* [b]. It is, however, necessary to observe, that the eminent divines, who first set on foot this new species of theology, and thus laudably maintained that most noble and natural connexion of FAITH with REASON, and of RELIGION with PHILOSOPHY, were much more prudent, and moderate than their followers, in the use and application of this conciliatory scheme. They kept, for the most part, within bounds, and wisely reflected upon the limits of reason;

[(a) Otherwise called BERENGARIUS, and famous for the noble opposition he made to the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which LANFRANC so absurdly pretended to support upon philosophical principles. The attempt of this latter to introduce the rules of logic into religious controversy would have been highly laudable, had not he perverted this respectable science to the defence of the most monstrous absurdities.]

[b] See CHR. AUGUST. HEUMANNI *Præfat. ad Tribbeckovii Librum de Doctoribus Scholasticis*, p. 14.—The sentiments of the learned, concerning the first author or inventor of the scholastic divinity, are collected by JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, in his *Isagogè ad Theolog.* tom. i. p. 358.

CENT. XI. son; their language was clear; the questions they proposed were instructive and interesting; they avoided all discussions that were only proper to satisfy a vain and idle curiosity; and, in their disputes and demonstrations, they made, generally speaking, a wise and sober use of the rules of logic, and of the dictates of philosophy [c]. [Their followers, on the contrary, ran with a metaphysical frenzy into the greatest abuses, and, by the most unjustifiable perversion of a wise and excellent method of searching after, and confirming truth, they banished evidence out of religion, common sense out of philosophy, and erected a dark, and enormous mass of pretended

[c] We shall here transcribe a passage from the works of LANFRANC, who is considered by many as the father of the scholastic system, that the reader may see how far the first schoolmen surpassed their disciples and followers in wisdom, modesty, and candour. We take this passage from that prelate's book concerning *The Body and Blood of Christ* *, and it is as follows: *Testis mihi Deus est et conscientia mea, quia in tractatu divinarum litterarum nec proponere nec ad propositas respondere cuperem dialecticas quæstiones, vel earum solutiones. Et si quando materia disputanditalis est, ut hujus artis regulis valeat enucleatius explicari, in quantum possum, per æquipollentias propositionum tego artem, ne videar magis arte, quam veritate, sanctorumque patrum auctoritate confidere.* LANFRANC here declares in the most solemn manner, even by an appeal to God and his conscience, that he was so far from having the least inclination to propose or to answer logical questions in the course of his theological labours, that, on the contrary, when he was forced to have recourse to the science of dialectic, in order the better to illustrate his subject, he concealed the succours he derived from thence with all possible care, lest he should seem to place more confidence in the resources of *art*, than in the simplicity of *truth*, and the *authority of the holy fathers*. These last words shew plainly the *two* sources from whence the Christian doctors had hitherto derived all their tenets, and the arguments by which they maintained them, *viz.* from the holy scriptures which LANFRANC here calls the *truth*, and from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church. To these two sources of theology and argumentation, a *third* was added in this century, even the science of logic, which, however, was only employed by the managers of controversy to repulse their adversaries, who came armed with syllogisms, or to remove difficulties which were drawn from reason and from the nature of things. But, in succeeding times, the two former sources were either entirely neglected or sparingly employed, and philosophical demonstration, or, at least, something that bore that name, was regarded as a sufficient support to the truths of religion.

* Cap. vii. p. 236. Opp. Ed. LUC. DACHERII.

pretended *science*, in which *words* passed for *ideas*, and *sounds* for *sense*.] CENT. XI.

VI. No sooner was this new method introduced, than the Latin doctors began to reduce all the doctrines of religion into one permanent and connected system, and to treat theology as a science; an enterprize, which had hitherto been attempted by none, but *TAIO*, of *Saragossa*, a writer of the viith century, and the learned *DAMASCENUS*, who flourished among the Greeks in the following age. The Latin doctors had hitherto confined their theological labours to certain branches of the Christian religion, which they illustrated only on certain occasions. The first production which looked like a general system of theology was that of the celebrated *ANSELM*; this however was surpassed by the complete and universal body of divinity, which was composed, towards the conclusion of this century, by *HILDEBERT*, archbishop of *Tours*, who seems to have been regarded both as the first and the best model in this kind of writing, by the innumerable legions of system-makers, who arose in succeeding times [*d*]. This learned prelate demonstrated first the doctrines of his system by proofs drawn from the holy scriptures, and also from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church; and in this he followed the custom that had prevailed in the preceding ages; but he went yet farther, and answered the objections, which might be brought against his doctrine, by arguments drawn from reason and philosophy; this part of his method was entirely new, and peculiar to the age in which he lived [*e*].

VII. The

[*d*] This body of divinity, which was the first complete theological system that had been composed among the Latins, is inserted in the *Works* of *HILDEBERT*, published by *BEAUGENDRE*, who shews evidently, in his *Preface*, that *PETER LOMBARD*, *PULLUS*, and the other writers of theological systems, did no more than follow servilely the traces of *HILDEBERT*.

[*e*] It may not be improper to place here a passage which is taken from a treatise of *ANSELM*'s, entitled, *Cur deus homo?* since this passage was respected, by the first scholastic divines, as an immutable law

CENT. XI.

Moral writers.

VII. The moral writers of this century, who undertook to unfold the obligations of Christians, and to delineate the nature, the extent, and the various branches of true virtue and evangelical obedience, treated this most excellent of all sciences in a manner quite unsuitable to its dignity and importance. We find sufficient proofs of this in the moral writings of PETER DAMIEN [f], and even of the learned HILDEBERT [g]. The moralists of this age generally confined themselves to a jejune explication of, what are commonly called, the four cardinal virtues, to which they added the *Ten Commandments*, to complete their system. ANSELM, the famous prelate of *Canterbury*, surpassed, indeed, all the moral writers of his time; the books which he composed; with a design to promote practical religion, and more especially his *Book of Meditations and Prayers*, contain many excellent things, several happy thoughts expressed with much energy and unction. [Nor did the mystic divines satisfy themselves with piercing, by *extatic thought and feeling*, into the sublime regions of *beauty and love*; they conceived, and brought forth several productions that were destined to diffuse the pure delights of *union and communion* through enamoured souls] JOHANNES JOHANNELLUS, a Latin mystic, wrote a treatise concerning *Divine Contemplation* [b]; and SIMEON, the younger, who was a Grecian sage of the same visionary class, composed several discourses upon subjects of a like nature.

The state of
controversial
divinity.

VIII. Among the controversial writers of this century, we see the effects of the scholastic method that BERANGER and LANFRANC had introduced into the study of theology. We see divines entering the lists armed with

in theology; *Sicut rectus ordo exigit*, says the learned prelate, *ut profunda fidei Christianæ credamus, priusquam ea præsumamus ratione discutere; ita negligentia mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere*; which amounts to this, *That we must first believe without examination, but must afterwards endeavour to understand what we believe.*

[f] See PETRUS DAMIANUS, *De Virtutibus*.

[g] See HILDEBERTI *Philosophia Moralis, et Libellus de 14 Virtutibus honestæ vitæ*.

[b] See the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 48.

with syllogisms, which they manage awkwardly, and aiming rather to confound their adversaries by the subtilties of logic, than to convince them by the power of evidence. While those, who were unprovided with this philosophical armour made a still more wretched and despicable figure, fell into the grossest and most perverse blunders, and seem to have written without thinking of their subject, or of the manner of treating it with success. DAMIANUS, already mentioned, defended the truth of Christianity against the Jews; but his success was not equal to the warmth of his zeal, or to the uprightness of his intentions. SAMUEL, a convert from *Judaism* to Christianity, wrote an elaborate treatise against those of his nation, which is still extant. But the noblest champion, that appeared at this period of time in the cause of religion, was the famous ANSELM, who attacked the enemies of Christianity, and the audacious contemners of all religion in an ingenious work [i], which was perhaps, by its depth and acuteness, above the comprehension of those whom it was designed to convince of their errors. [For it happened, no doubt, in these earlier times, as it frequently does in our days, that many gave themselves out for unbelievers, who knew not the first principles of reasoning, and whose incredulity was the fruit of ignorance and presumption, nourished by licentiousness and corruption of heart.]

IX. The famous contest between the Greek and Latin churches, which though not decided, had, however, been suspended for a considerable time, was imprudently revived, in the year 1053, by MICHAEL CERULARIUS, patriarch of *Constantinople*, a man of a restless and turbulent spirit, who blew the flame of religious discord, and widened the fatal breach by new invectives and new accusations. The pretexts that were employed to justify this new rupture, were zeal for the truth, and an anxious concern about the interests of religion; but its true causes were the arrogance and ambition of the

The controversy
between the
Greeks and
Latins re-
vived

[i] This work was entitled, *Liber adversus insipientem*, i. e. *The fool refuted*.

CENT. XI. Grecian patriarch and the Roman pontiff. The latter was constantly forming the most artful stratagems to reduce the former under his imperious yoke; and, for this purpose, he left no means unemployed to gain over to his side the bishops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, by withdrawing them from the jurisdiction of the see of *Constantinople*. The tumultuous and unhappy state of the Grecian empire was singularly favourable to his aspiring views, as the friendship and alliance of the Roman pontiff was highly useful to the Greeks in their struggles with the Saracens and the Normans, who were settled in *Italy*. On the other hand, the Grecian pontiff was not only determined to refuse obstinately the least mark of submission to his haughty rival, but was also laying schemes for extending his dominion, and for reducing all the Oriental patriarchs under his supreme jurisdiction. Thus the contending parties were preparing for the field of controversy, when CERULARIUS began the charge by a warm letter wrote in his own name, and in the name of LEO bishop of *Achrida*, who was his chief counsellor, to JOHN, bishop of *Trani*, in *Apulia*, in which he publicly accused the Latins of various errors [k]. LEO IX, who was then in the papal chair, answered this letter in a most imperious manner; and not satisfied with shewing his indignation by mere words, assembled a council at *Rome*, in which the Greek churches were solemnly excommunicated [l].

X. CONSTANTINE, surnamed *Monomachus*, who was now at the head of the Grecian empire, endeavoured to stifle this controversy in its birth, and for that purpose, desired the Roman pontiff to send legates to *Constantinople*, to concert measures for restoring and confirming the tranquillity of the church. Three legates were accordingly sent from *Rome* to that imperial city, who brought with them letters from LEO IX not only to the

[k] See an account of these errors § xi.

[l] These letters of CERULARIUS and LEO are published in the *Annals* of BARONIUS, *ad An.* 1053—The former is also inserted by CANISIUS, in his *Lectio. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 281. ed. nov.—LEONIS *Concilia*, &c.

emperor, but also to the Grecian pontiff. These legates CENT. XI. were cardinal HUMBERT, a man of a high and impetuous spirit, PETER, archbishop of *Amalfi*, and FREDERIC, archdeacon and chancellor of the church of *Rome*. The issue of this congress was unhappy in the highest degree, notwithstanding the propensity which the emperor, for political reasons [*m*], discovered to the cause of the bishop of *Rome*. The arrogance of LEO IX, and his insolent letters, excited the highest indignation in the breast of CERULARIUS, and produced a personal aversion to this audacious pontiff, which inflamed, instead of healing the wounds of the church; while, on the other hand, the Roman legates gave many and evident proofs, that the design of their embassy was not to restore peace and concord, but to establish among the Greeks the supreme authority and the ghostly dominion of *Rome's* imperious pontiff. Thus all hopes of a happy conclusion of these miserable divisions entirely vanished, and the Roman legates finding their efforts ineffectual to overcome the vigorous resistance of CERULARIUS, they, with the highest insolence, as well as imprudence, excommunicated publickly in the church of *St. Sophia*, A. D. 1054, the Grecian patriarch, with LEO of *Acbrida*, and all their adherents; and leaving a written act of their inhuman imprecations and anathemas upon the grand altar of that temple, they *shook the dust off their feet*, and thus departed. This violent step rendered the evil incurable, which it was before not only possible, but perhaps easy to remedy. The Grecian patriarch imitated the vehemence of the Roman legates, and did from resentment what they had perpetrated from a principle of ambition and arrogance. He excommunicated these legates with all their adherents and followers in a public council, and procured an order of the emperor for burning the act of excommunication, which they had pro-

[(*m*) He stood greatly in need of the assistance of the Germans and Italians against the Normans, and hoped to obtain it by the good offices of the pope, who was in high credit with the emperor HENRY III.]

CENT. XI. nounced against the Greeks [n]. These vehement measures were followed on both sides with a multitude of controversial writings, that were filled with the most bitter and irritating invectives and served no other purpose, than to add fuel to the flame.

XI. CERULARIUS added new accusations to the ancient charge which had been brought by PHOTIUS against the Latin churches, of which the principal was, that they used unleavened bread in the celebration of the Lord's supper. This accusation (such were the times!) was looked upon as a matter of the most serious nature, and of the highest consequence; it was, therefore, debated between the Greeks and Latins with the utmost vehemence, nor did the Grecian and Roman pontiffs contend with more fury and bitterness about the extant of their power, and the limits of their jurisdiction, than the Greek and Latin churches disputed about the use of unleavened bread. The other heads of accusation that were brought against the Latins by the Grecian pontiff discovered rather a malignant and contentious spirit, and a profound ignorance of genuine Christianity, than a generous zeal for the cause of truth. He complains, for instance, in the heaviest manner, that the Latins don't abstain from the use of blood and of things strangled; that their monks eat lard, and permit the use of flesh to such of the brethren as are sick or infirm; that their bishops adorn their fingers with rings, as if they were bride-grooms; that their priests are beardless; and that in the rite of baptism they confined themselves to one single immersion [o]. Such were the mis-

[n] Besides BARONIUS and other writers, whose accounts of this period of time are generally known, and not always exact, see MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. lib. lx. ad A. 1053. et *Præf. ad Sæc. vi. Ador. SS. Benedicte*, part. II. p. 1.—LEO ALLATIUS, *De libris Græcor. Ecclesiast. Diff.* ii. p. 160. ed. Fabricii, et *De perpetua Eccles. Orient. et Occident. Consensione*, lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 614.—MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriente Christiano*, tom. i. p. 260. et *Diff. Damascena prima*, § xxxi. p. 16.—HERMANNI *Historia Concertationum de pane Azymo et fermentato*, p. 59. published at Leipzig in the year 1739.—JO. BAPT. COTELERIUS, *Monum. Ecclesiæ Græcæ*, tom. ii. p. 108.

[o] See CERULARII *Epistola ad Johannem Tranensem in Canisii Lecti-*

miserable and trifling objects that excited a fatal schism, CENT. XI. and kindled a furious war between the Greeks and Latins, who carried their animosities to the greatest lengths, and loaded each other with reciprocal invectives and imprecations. The attentive reader will form from hence a just idea of the deplorable state of religion both in the eastern and western world at this period, and will see, in this dreadful schism, the true origin of the various sects that multiplied the different forms of superstition and error in these unhappy times.

XII. This vehement dispute which the Greeks had to carry on against the Latin churches was well nigh followed by a fatal division among themselves. Amidst the straits and difficulties to which the empire was now reduced by the expences of war, and the calamities of the times, ALEXIUS not only employed the treasures of the church in order to answer the exigencies of the state, but ordered also the plates of silver, and the figures of that metal that adorned the portals of the churches, to be taken down and converted into money. This measure excited the indignation of LEO, bishop of *Chalcedon*, a man of austere morals, and of an obstinate spirit, who maintained that the emperor, in this step, was guilty of sacrilege; and to prove this charge, published a treatise, in which he affirmed, that in the images of JESUS CHRIST, and of the saints, there resided a certain kind of *inherent sanctity*, that was a proper object of religious worship, and that, therefore, the adoration of Christians ought not to be confined to the persons represented by these images, but extended also to the images themselves. This new controversy excited various tumults and seditions among the people, to suppress which the emperor assembled a council at *Constantinople*, in which the question was terminated by the following decisions: " That the images of CHRIST, and of the *saints*, were

A new controversy concerning the sanctity of images.

en. Antiq. t. iii. p. 281. where the reader will also find the refutation of this letter by Cardinal HUMBERT. See likewise CERULARII *Epistola ad Petrum Antiochenf.* in COTELERII *Monumentis Ecclesiæ Græc.* tom. ii. p. 138. add to these MARTENE, *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 847.

CENT. XI. “ to be honoured only with a *relative worship* [p], which
 “ was to be offered, not to the substance or matter of
 “ which the seimages were composed, but to the *form* and
 “ *features* of which they bore the impression ; that the
 “ representations of CHRIST, and of the saints, whe-
 “ ther in painting or sculpture, did in no sense *partake*
 “ *of the nature* of the divine Saviour, or of these holy
 “ men, though they were enriched with a certain com-
 “ munication of divine grace ; and, lastly, that invoca-
 “ tion and worship were to be addressed to the saints,
 “ only as the servants of CHRIST, and on account of
 “ their relation to him, as their master.” These deci-
 sions absurd and superstitious as they were, were not e-
 nough so for LEO, the idolatrous bishop of *Chalcedon*,
 who maintained his monstrous system with obstinacy,
 and was, for that reason, sent into banishment [q].

Controver-
sies in the
Latin church
about the
Lord's sup-
per.

XIII. The famous dispute concerning the *presence* of
 CHRIST'S body and blood in the eucharist was revived
 about the middle of this century in the Latin church.
 Hitherto the disputants on both sides had proposed their
 jarring opinions with the utmost freedom, unrestrained
 by the despotic voice of authority, since no council had
 given a definitive answer upon this matter, nor prescrib-
 ed a rule of faith to terminate all inquiry and debate
 [r]. Hence it was, that, in the beginning of this cen-
 tury, LEUTHERIC, archbishop of *Sens*, affirmed, in op-
 position to the general opinion of the times, that none
 but the sincere and upright Christian, none but saints
 and real believers, received the body of CHRIST in the
 holy sacrament. This opinion, which was broached in
 the year 1004, was every way proper to excite rumours

(p) Σχετικῶς προσκυνῶμεν, ὃ λατρευτικῶς τὰς εἰκόνας.

[q] An ample account of this whole matter is given by ANNA COM-
 NENA, in her *Alexiad*, lib. v. p. 104. lib. vii. p. 158. edit. *Venet.*—
 The acts of this council, the very mention of which is omitted by feve-
 ral historians of considerable note, are published by MONTFAUCON, in
 his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 103.

[r] The various opinions concerning the sacrament of the Lord's sup-
 per, that were embraced during this century, are collected by MAR-
 TENE from an ancient manuscript, and published in his *Voyage Litteraire*
de deux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur. tom. ii. p. 126.

among

among the people; but these its natural effects were CENT. XI.
 happily prevented by the influence of ROBERT, king of
France, and the wise counsels of some prudent friends,
 who hindered the fanatical prelate from disseminating
 this whimsical invention [s]. It was not so easy to ex-
 tinguish the zeal, or to stop the mouth of the famous
 BERENGER, principal of the public school at *Tours*, and
 afterwards archbishop of *Angers*, a man of a most acute
 and subtle genius, and highly renowned both on ac-
 count of his extensive learning, and the exemplary sanc-
 tity of his life and manners [t]. This eminent ecclesiastic
 maintained publickly, in the year 1045, the doctrine
 of JOHANNES SCOTUS, opposed warmly the monstrous
 opinions of PASCHASIUS RADBERT, which were adapt-
 ed to captivate a superstitious multitude by exciting
 their astonishment, and persevered with a noble obsti-
 nacy in teaching that the bread and wine were not
 changed into the body and blood of CHRIST in the eu-
 charist, but preserved their natural and essential quali-
 ties, and were no more than figures and external sym-
 bols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour. This
 wise and rational doctrine was no sooner published, than
 it was opposed by certain doctors in *France* and *Germany*;
 but the Roman pontiff LEO IX attacked it with peculiar
 vehemence and fury in the year 1050; and in two
 councils, the one assembled at *Rome*, and the other at
Vercelli, had the doctrine of BERENGER solemnly con-
 demned, and the book of SCOTUS, from which it was
 drawn, committed to the flames. This example was
 followed by the council of *Paris*, which was summoned
 the very same year by HENRY I, and in which BEREN-
 GER; and his numerous adherents, were menaced with
 all sorts of evils, both spiritual and temporal. These

[s] See DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris* tom. i. p. 354.

[t] See the *Life* of BERENGER in the *Works* of HILDEBERT, arch-
 deacon of *Mans*, p. 1324.—See also *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii.
 p. 197.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris* tom. i. p. 304. and the authors
 mentioned by FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. med. ævi*, tom. i. p. 570. It
 is probably by a press-error, that HILDEBERT is styled *archbishop*, in-
 stead of *archdeacon*, by PARIS *Hist.* lib. i. p. 10, edit. *Watts*.

CENT. XI. threats were executed, in part, against this unhappy prelate, whom HENRY deprived of all his revenues; but neither threatnings, nor fines, nor synodical decrees could shake the firmness of his mind, or engage him to renounce the doctrine he had embraced.

The pontiffs strive, in vain, to put an end to this debate.

XIV. After these proceedings the controversy was for some years happily suspended, and BERENGER, whose patrons were as numerous, as his enemies were formidable [u], enjoyed, for a while the sweets of liberty and peace. His enemies, however, after the death of LEO IX, rekindled the flame of religious discord, and persuaded his successor VICTOR II to examine anew the doctrine of BERENGER. The pontiff complied and sent his legates to two different councils that were assembled at *Tours*, in the year 1054 [w], for that purpose. In one of these councils the famous HILDEBRAND, who was afterwards pontiff under the title of GREGORY VII, appeared in the character of legate, and opposed the new doctrine with the utmost vehemence. BERENGER was also present at this assembly, and overpowered with threats, rather than convinced by reason and argument, he not only abandoned his opinions, but (if we may believe his adversaries, to whose testimony we are confined in this matter) abjured them solemnly, and, in consequence of this humbling step, made his peace with the church. This abjuration, however, was far from being sincere, and the docility of BERENGER was no more than an act of dissimulation; for soon after this period, he taught anew, though with more circumspection and prudence, the opinions he had formerly professed. That his conduct here appears mean and dishonest, is indeed evident; but we are not sufficiently acquainted with the transactions of these councils to fix precisely the degree of his crime.

XV. The account of BERENGER's perfidy being brought to NICOLAS II, the exasperated pontiff sum-

[u] His most formidable enemy and rival was, LANFRANC, archbishop of *Canterbury*.

[(w) Other historians mention but one council, and place it in the year 1055.]

moned him to *Rome* A. D. 1058, and terrified him, in CENT. XI.
such a manner, in the council held there the following, —
year, that he declared his readiness to embrace and adhere to the doctrines which that venerable assembly should think proper to impose upon his faith. HUMBERT was accordingly appointed unanimously by NICOLAS and the council to draw up a confession of faith for BERENGER, who signed it publicly, and confirmed his adherence to it by a solemn oath. In this confession there was, among other tenets equally absurd, the following declaration, that *the bread and wine, after consecration, were not only a SACRAMENT, but also the REAL BODY AND BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST; and that this body and blood were handled by the priests and consumed by the faithful, and not in a sacramental sense, but in reality and truth, as other sensible objects are.* This doctrine was so monstrously nonsensical, and was such an impudent insult upon the very first principles of reason, that it could have nothing alluring to a man of BERENGER's acute and philosophical turn, nor could it possibly become the object of his serious belief, as appeared soon after this odious act of dissimulation; for no sooner was he returned into *France*, than taking refuge in the countenance and protection of his ancient patrons, he expressed the utmost detestation and abhorrence of the doctrines he had been obliged to profess at *Rome*, abjured them solemnly both in his discourse and in his writings, and returned zealously to the profession and defence of his former, which had always been his real, opinion.

ALEXANDER II employed the seducing influence of soft and friendly exhortation to engage BERENGER to dissemble anew, or, in other words, to return from his pretended apostacy; but his remonstrances were ineffectual, and that perhaps in a great measure, because this rebellious son of a superstitious church was powerfully supported in the maintenance of his opinions. Hence the controversy was prolonged, during many years, by a multitude of writings on both sides of the question, and the followers of BERENGER increased from day to day.

XVI. GREGORY VII, whose enterprizing spirit no difficulties nor oppositions could discourage, was no sooner raised to the pontificate than he undertook to terminate this important controversy, and, for that purpose, sent an order to BERENGER, in the year 1078, to repair to *Rome*. Considering the natural character of this pontiff, his conduct in this affair was highly laudable, and discovered a degree of impartiality and candour, which his proceedings upon other occasions gave little reason to expect. He seems to have a high esteem for BERENGER, and in the particular points in which he was obliged to oppose him, he did it with all possible mildness, and with a tenderness which shewed that he acted rather from a forced compliance with the clamours of his adversaries, than from inclination or principle. In the council that was held at *Rome* towards the conclusion of the year 1078, he permitted BERENGER to draw up a new confession of his faith, and to renounce that which had been composed by HUMBERT, though it had been solemnly approved and confirmed by NICOLAS II and a Roman council. The sagacious pontiff perceived clearly the absurdity of HUMBERT's confession, and therefore revoked it, though it had been rendered sacred by papal authority [x]. In consequence of this, the persecuted prelate made a second declaration confirmed by an oath, that he would adhere for the future to the following propositions: That *the bread laid upon the altar became, after consecration, the true body of CHRIST, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and now sits at the right-hand of the father*: and that *the wine placed upon the altar, became, after consecration, the true blood, which flowed from the side of CHRIST*. The pontiff was satisfied with this declaration, which was far from produc-

[x] It is worthy of observation, that GREGORY VII, whose zeal in extending the jurisdiction and exalting the authority of the Roman pontiffs surpassed that of all his predecessors, acknowledged, at least tacitly, by this step, that a pope and council might err, and had erred in effect. How otherwise could he allow BERENGER to renounce a confession of faith, that had been solemnly approved and confirmed by NICOLAS II, and a Roman council?

ing

ing the same effect upon the enemies of BERENGER, CENT. XI. they shewed that it was ambiguous, and so it was in reality, and they insisted that BERENGER should be obliged not only to sign another declaration less vague and equivocal, but should also be required to prove his sincerity by the fiery trial. GREGORY refused absolutely this latter demand, and would have equally refused the other, had not his favourable intentions towards BERENGER yielded to the importunate clamours of his enemies and persecutors.

XVII. The pontiff, therefore, granted that part of their demand that related to a new declaration, and, in a council held at *Rome* A. D. 1079, had a third confession of faith drawn up, which was somewhat less absurd than the first, though much more harsh than the second, and to which BERENGER, after reading and subscribing it in the midst of the assembly, was obliged to declare his assent by a solemn oath. By this assent he professed to believe, *That the bread and wine were, by the mysterious influence of the holy prayer, and the words of our redeemer, substantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of JESUS CHRIST*: and to remove all grounds of suspicion, to dispel all doubt the reality of his attachment to this ridiculous system, he added to his second confession [y] a solemn declaration, that *the bread and wine, after consecration, were converted into the real body and blood of CHRIST, not only in quality of external signs and sacramental representations, but in their essential properties, and in substantial reality*. No sooner had BERENGER made this strange declaration, than the pontiff redoubled the marks of esteem which he had formerly shewn him, and sent him back to his country loaded with the most honourable testimonies of his liberality and friendship. The doubleminded doctor did not, however, think himself bound by this declaration solemn as it was; and therefore retracted publicly, upon his return to his residence, what he had subscribed as his real sentiments in the council of *Rome*, and went even so far as to compose an elaborate

[y] Mentioned in the preceding section.

CENT. XI. refutation of the doctrine to which he had been engaged to profess his assent. This new change excited a warm and vehement controversy, in which LANFRANC and GUITMUND endeavoured to perplex BERENGER with their sophistry, and to overwhelm him with their invectives. GREGORY VII, to whose papal thunder the affronted council looked with impatience, seemed neither surprized nor offended by the inconstancy of BERENGER, nor did he take any step which could testify the smallest mark of resentment against this pretended apostate. From hence it appears more than probable, that the second confession of BERENGER had entirely satisfied that pontiff, and that the violent imposition of the third was by no means agreeable to GREGORY, who seems to have adopted, in a great measure, if not wholly, the sentiments of BERENGER [z].

XVIII. A-

[z] A remarkable treatise of BERENGER's composition, which has been published by MARTENE, in his *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. iv. p. 99. 109. will contribute to cast a satisfactory light upon this whole affair, and will fully unfold the real sentiments of GREGORY concerning the eucharist. For from this piece it is undoubtedly evident; 1st, That BERENGER was esteemed and favoured, in a singular manner, by GREGORY VII. 2^{dly}, That this pontiff was of the same opinion with BERENGER concerning the eucharist; it is certain, at least, that he was for adhering to the words of scripture in this matter, and was eager in suppressing all curious researches and all positive decisions concerning the manner of CHRIST's presence in the holy sacrament. This appears evidently from the following words, which he addressed to BERENGER before the meeting of the last council of Rome, and in which he speaks of his design to consult the Virgin MARY concerning the conduct which it was proper for him to observe in the course of this controversy: *Ego plane te* (says the pontiff in the 108th page of the work, cited in the beginning of this note) *de Christi sacrificio secundum scripturas bene sentire non dubito: tamen quia consuetudinis mihi est, ad B. Mariam de his quæ movent recurrere—imposui religioso cuidam amico—a B. Maria obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret, sed verbis commendaret, quorsum me de negotio quod in manibus habebam de Christi sacrificio reciperem, in quo immotus persisterem.* We see here plainly, that GREGORY expresses the strongest propensity to the sentiments of BERENGER, not, however, without some hesitation concerning the manner in which he was to conduct himself, and also concerning the precise doctrine, which it was necessary to embrace in relation to the presence of CHRIST in the eucharist. It was this hesitation which led him to consult the Virgin MARY, whose answer the pontiff gives in the following words:

A. B.

XVIII. Amidst the clamours of his incensed adversaries, BERENGER observed a profound silence, and was prudent enough to return no answer to their bitter and repeated invectives. Fatigued with a controversy, in which the first principles of reason were so impudently insulted, and exhausted by an opposition which he was unable to overcome, he abandoned all his world-

CENT. XI.

Berenger's
fate, and the
progress of
his doctrine.

A. B. Maria audivit et ad me retulit, nihil de sacrificio Christi cogitandum, nihil esse tenendum, nisi quod tenerent authenticæ scripturæ, contra quas BERENGARIUS nihil habebat. Hoc tibi manifestare volui, ut securiorem ad nos fiduciam et alacriorem spem habeas. Here we see an answer of the Virgin pronouncing that it was necessary to adhere to the express declarations of scripture concerning the presence of CHRIST in the sacrament; and whether GREGORY was fanatical enough to confide in this answer as real, or rogue enough to forge it, it is still certain, that he confined his belief concerning the point in debate to the language of scripture, and held that the true body and blood of CHRIST were exhibited in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, though it was neither necessary nor expedient to inquire into the nature or manner of this mysterious presence. 3dly, It appears manifest from the treatise already mentioned, that the assembling of the second council, and the imposition of another confession of faith upon the conscience of BERENGER, were measures into which GREGORY was forced by the enemies of that ecclesiastic. *Dejectus est, says BERENGER, speaking of that pontiff, importunitate Paduani scurræ, non episcopi, et Pisani non episcopi, sed antichristi . . . ut permitteret calumniatoribus veritatis in posteriori quadragesimali concilio scriptum a se firmatum in priori mutari.* 4thly, We see here the true reason why GREGORY shewed not the smallest mark of resentment against BERENGER, when, upon his return to his own country, he violated the promise by which he had so solemnly bound himself in the last council, and refuted the confession to which he had sworn his assent. For the pontiff was very far from adopting the sentiments of those who had drawn up, or suggested that monstrous confession, and esteemed it sufficient to believe with BERENGER, that the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST were exhibited to Christians in the eucharist. Hence he let the violent adversaries of his persecuted friend murmur, scribble, bawl, and refute, while he himself observed a profound silence, and persisted in his resolution to put that unhappy man to no farther trouble. It is, however, proper to observe, that in the same book, from whence these particulars are taken, we find BERENGER addressing himself, with the utmost humility, to the divine mercy for the pardon of the crime of dissimulation and perjury he had committed at Rome; and confessing that the fear of death had extorted from him oaths and declarations diametrically opposite to his real sentiments, and engaged him to subscribe to a set of tenets which he abhorred. *Deus omnipotens, says he, miserere, fons misericordiarum, tantum sacrilegium agnoscenti.*

CENT. XI. ly concerns, and retired to the isle of *St. Cosme*, in the neighbourhood of *Tours*, where he spent the remainder of his days in fasting, prayer, and pious exercises. In the year 1088, death put an end to the affliction he suffered in his retirement; from a bitter reflection upon the dissimulation he had been guilty of at *Rome*, and to the penitential acts of mortification and austerity, to which he seems to have submitted with a design to expiate the enormity of his criminal compliance, and the guilt of his perjury [a]. He left behind him in the minds of the people a deep impression of his extraordinary sanctity, and his followers were as numerous as his fame was illustrious [b]. There have been disputes among the learned about the real sentiments of this eminent man: yet, notwithstanding the art which he sometimes used to conceal his opinions, and the ambiguity that is often remarkable in his expressions, whoever examines with impartiality and attention such of his writings as are yet extant, will immediately perceive, that he looked upon the bread and wine in the sacrament as no more than the signs or symbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour [c].
In

[a] This will appear evident to such as peruse the treatise of his composition, which we have mentioned in the preceding note, as published in MARTENE'S *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. iv. p. 109.

[b] The canons of the cathedral of *Tours* continue to honour the memory of BERENGER by an annual procession, in which they perform a solemn service at his tomb in the isle of *St. Cosme*. See MOLEON, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 130.

[c] MABILLON and other Roman catholic writers, as also a few Lutheran divines, are of opinion, that BERENGER denied only the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, while he maintained, at the same time, the real presence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the eucharist. And this opinion will, indeed, appear plausible to such as consider only the declaration he signed in the first council at *Rome*, to which he was summoned by GREGORY VII, and which he never retracted, without comparing this declaration with the rest of his writings. On the other hand, USHER, BASNAGE, and almost all the writers of the reformed church maintain, that the doctrine of BERENGER was exactly the same with that which CALVIN afterwards adopted; and I cannot help joining with them in this opinion, when I peruse attentively the following words

In this opinion BERENGER persevered to the last, nor CENT. XI.
have we any authentic proof of his having departed
from it before his death, as some of the Roman catholic
writers vainly pretend [d].

XIX. It

words of his *Letter* to ALMANNUS, published in MARTENE's *Thesaur.* tom. iv. p. 109. *Constat.* says BERENGER in express terms, *verum Christi corpus in ipsa mensa proponi, SED SPIRITUALITER INTERIORI HOMINI VERUM in ea Christi corpus ab his duntaxat, qui Christi membra sunt, incorruptum, intaminatum, inattritumque SPIRITUALITER MAN- DUCARI.* These words demonstrate so clearly, that, by the *presence* of CHRIST's body in the eucharist, BERENGER meant no more than a *spiritual presence*, that they dispel all doubt about his real sentiments though, upon other occasions, he concealed these sentiments under dubious expressions to deceive his adversaries.

[d] It is well known what laborious efforts the Roman catholic writers have employed to persuade us, that BERENGER, before his death, abandoned the opinion he had so long and so warmly defended, and returned to the doctrine of the church of Rome concerning the corporeal presence of CHRIST in the eucharist. But when we inquire into the reasons on which this assertion is founded, we shall immediately perceive their weakness and insufficiency. They alledge, in the first place, that BERENGER gave an account of his doctrine and belief in the council of Bourdeaux, A. D. 1087; and add to this, that the ancient writers applaud his penitential sentiments, and affirm that he died in the catholic faith. In all this, however, we see no proof of BERENGER's retractation. He adhered, indeed, to the confession of faith, which he had subscribed and adopted in the first of the two Roman councils, to which he had been summoned by GREGORY VII, and which that pontiff judged sufficient to clear him from the imputation of heresy; and they, who confined their attention to the *literal sense* of the words of that confession, without considering their *spirit*, and the different meanings of which they were susceptible, might easily imagine that BERENGER's confession was agreeable to the doctrine of the church. GREGORY, in order to pacify matters, confirmed them in this notion; and though he was well informed of BERENGER's having retracted the confession which he had signed in the last Roman council before which he appeared, and of his opposing, with the utmost warmth, the opinion he had there so solemnly professed, yet he let the inconstant doctor remain unmolested, and thereby tacitly acquitted him of the crime and the error that were laid to his charge.

It is of the utmost importance to observe here, that the Roman church was not come, in this century, to a fixed determination concerning the *nature* and *manner* of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist. This appears most evidently from the three confessions which BERENGER signed by the order of three councils, which confessions differed from each other, not only in the terms and the turn of expression, but also in the opinions and doctrines they contained. Pope NICOLAS II.

CENT. XI.

A controver-
sy concerning
Marial.

XIX. It is not rare to find in the history of the church the most trifling objects exciting the warmest and most vehement

and the council he assembled at *Rome* A. D. 1059, obliged him to subscribe, as the true and orthodox doctrine of the church, the first of these confessions, which was composed by Cardinal HUMBERT. This confession was, however, rejected, not only as harsh in point of expression, but also as erroneous and unsound, by GREGORY and the two Roman councils, which he had expressly summoned to inquire into that matter; for had HUMBERT's declaration appeared to the pontiff to be a just expression of the doctrine and sense of the church concerning the eucharist, neither he nor the succeeding councils would have permitted other forms of doctrine to be substituted in its place. GREGORY, as we have already seen, was of opinion, that it was highly improper to pry with too much curiosity into the mysteries of the eucharist, and that, laying aside all disputes concerning the manner of CHRIST's presence in that holy institution, it was safest to adhere to the plain words of scripture; and as this was also the opinion of BERENGER, and was plainly expressed in his confession of faith, the judicious pontiff pronounced him innocent. But a following council departed from this equitable sentence of GREGORY, who, though with much reluctance, was induced to confirm their rigorous decisions; and hence arose a third confession, which was extremely different from the two preceding ones. We may remark by the by, that in this controversy the councils seem plainly to have swayed the pontiffs, since we see the obstinate, the invincible GREGORY yielding, against his will, to one of these clamorous assemblies. BERENGER had no sooner got out of the hands of his enemies, than he returned to the second confession, which the pontiff had approved, and publicly declaimed against that which had been imposed upon him in the last Roman council before which he had appeared, without receiving the least mark of disapprobation from GREGORY. From this it was natural to conclude, that, although he opposed the decree of that council, he adopted nevertheless the opinion of the pope and of the church.

In the account which I have here given of this memorable controversy, I have not only consulted the ancient records relating to that matter, which have been made public (for several of them lie as yet in the cabinets of the curious) but have also been assisted by the labours of those among the learned, who have treated that important branch of Ecclesiastical History in the most ample and accurate manner: such as first, FRANC. DE ROYE's book, published at *Angers* in the year 1656; *Ad Can. Ego Berengarius 41. de consecrat. distinct. 2. Ubi vita, hæresis, et pœnitentia Berengarii Andegavenfis Archidiaconi et ad Josephi locum de Christo* (a book which is extremely curious, and very little known). MABILLON's *Præfat. ad tom. ix. AÆ. SS. Ord. Bened. Seu Sæc. vi. part. II. p. 4. et Dissert. de multiplici damnatione, fidei professione et lapsu*, which is published in his *Analecæ veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 456. DE BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 404. tom. ii. p. 452.* The authors of the reformed church, which I have followed in this controversy

vehement controversies. Such was the dispute that arose in *France*, in the year 1023, between the priests and monks of *Limoges*, concerning the place that was to be assigned in the public liturgy to MARTIAL, the first bishop of that diocese. One party headed by JORDAN, bishop of *Limoges*, were for placing him among the *confessors*; while HUGO abbot of the monastery of *St. Martial*, maintained, that the prelate in question was to be ranked among the *apostles*, and branded, with the opprobrious and heretical title of *Ebionites*, all such as adhered to the proposal of JORDAN. This momentous affair was debated first in a council held at *Poitiers* in the year 1023, and in another assembled at *Paris* the year following, in which latter it was determined, that MARTIAL was to be honoured with the title of an *apostle*, and that all who refused him this eminent rank were to be considered as *Ebionites*, who, as is well known confined the number of the apostles to twelve, that they might exclude *St. PAUL*, from that sacred order. The decree, however, of this council did not produce the effects that were expected from it; for it exasperated instead of calming the zeal and animosity of the contending parties, so that this miserable dispute became daily more universal, and spread like a contagion through all the provinces of *France*. The matter was, at length, brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff, JOHN XIX, who decided it in favour of the monks, and, in a letter addressed to JORDAN and the other bishops of the nation, pronounced MARTIAL worthy of the title and honours of an apostle. This decision produced the most substantial and permanent effects: for in a council assembled at *Limoges* A. D. 1029, JORDAN declared his ac-

controversy, are, USSERIUS *De Successione Ecclesiar. Christianar. in occidente*, cap. vii. § 24. p. 195.—BASNAGE *Hist. des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i. p. 105. et *Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 1391.—CAS. OUDIN. *Dissert. de Doctrina et Scriptis Berengarii in Comment. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 624. There appears more or less a certain spirit of partiality in all these writers; but this spirit is particularly notorious among those of the church of *Rome*.

CENT. XI. quiescence in the papal sentence; in a provincial council at *Bourges*, two years after, MARTIAL was associated to the company of the apostles with great solemnity in consequence of the decision of the Roman see, and about the same time this controversy was completely and finally terminated in a numerous council assembled at *Limoges*, in which the prayers that had been consecrated to the memory of the apostle MARTIAL by the zealous pontiff were publicly recited [e]. The warm contenders for the apostleship of MARTIAL, asserted that he was one of the seventy disciples of CHRIST, from whence they concluded that he had an equal title with PAUL and BARNABAS to the honour of an apostle.

C H A P. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

I. **T**HE form of public worship, which was established at *Rome*, had not, as yet, been universally received in the western provinces. This was looked upon by the imperious pontiffs as an insult upon their authority, and therefore they used their utmost efforts to introduce the Roman ceremonies every where, and to promote a perfect uniformity of worship in every part of the Latin world. GREGORY VII employed all his diligence, activity, and zeal in this enterprize, as appears from several passages in his letters, and he perhaps alone was equal to the execution of such an arduous attempt. The Spaniards

[e] See BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 372. 108.—J. LONGEVAL, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. vii. p. 188, 189. 231.—The Benedictine monks, in their *Gallia Christiana*, tom. iii. *Append. Documentor.* p. 162. have published the Letter of JORDAN to Pope BENEDICT VIII, against the Apostleship of Martial. The decrees of the councils of *Bourges* and *Limoges* concerning this matter are published by LABBE, in his *Biblioth. Nova Manuscriptor.* tom. ii. p. 766. MABILLON has given an ample account of ADEMAR, a monk of *St. Cybar*, the first promoter of this ridiculous controversy, in his *Annal. Ord. S. Benedict.* tom. iv. p. 318. and, among the original papers subjoined to that volume, has published a letter wrote by that monk in favour of the apostleship of MARTIAL. See also the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 301.

had long distinguished themselves above all other nations CENT. XI.
 by the noble and resolute resistance they made to the
 despotic attempts of the popes upon this occasion; for
 they adhered to their ancient *gothic* liturgy [f] with the
 utmost obstinacy, and could not be brought to change it
 for the method of worship established at *Rome*. ALEX-
 ANDER II had indeed proceeded so far, in the year
 1068, as to persuade the inhabitants of *Arragon* into
 his measures [g], and, to conquer the aversion which
 the Catalonians, had discovered for the Roman worship.
 But the honour of finishing this difficult work, and
 bringing it to perfection, was reserved for GREGORY
 VII, who, without interruption, exhorted, threatned,
 admonished, and entreated SANCIUS and ALPHONSO,
 the kings of *Arragon* and *Castile*, until, fatigued with
 the importunity of this restless pontiff, they consented to
 abolish the Gothic service in their churches, and to in-
 troduce the Roman in its place. SANCIUS was the first,
 who complied with the request of the ambitious pontiff,
 and, in the year 1080, his example was followed by
 ALPHONSO. The methods which the nobles of *Castile*
 employed to decide the matter were very extraordinary.
 First, they chose two champions who were to determine
 the controversy by single combat, the one fighting for
 the Roman liturgy, the other for the Gothic. This first
 trial ended in favour of the latter; for the Gothic hero
 proved victorious. The fiery trial was next made use
 of to terminate the dispute; the Roman and Gothic li-
 turgies were committed to the flames, which, as the
 story goes, consumed the former, while the latter re-
 mained unblemished and entire. Thus were [the Go-
 thic rites crowned with a double victory, which, how-
 ever, was not sufficient to maintain them against the au-
 thority of the pope, and the influence of the queen

[f] See MABILLON, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 10.

—JO. BONA, *Rerum Liturgicarum*, lib. i. cap. xi. p. 220. Opp.—
 PETR. LE BRUN, *Explication des Ceremonies de la Messe*, tom. ii. Diff.
 v. p. 272.

[g] PETR. DE MARCA, *Histoire de Bearn*, liv. ii. cap. ix.

CENT. XI. CONSTANTIA, who determined ALPHONSO in favour of the Roman service [b].

Divine wor-
ship per-
formed in an
unknown
and foreign
tongue.

II. The zeal of the Roman pontiffs for introducing a uniformity of worship into the western churches may be, in some measure, justified; but their not permitting every nation to celebrate divine worship in their mother tongue was absolutely inexcusable. While, indeed, the Latin language was in general use among the western nations, or, at least, was unknown to but a very small number, there was no reason why it should not be employed in the public service of the church. But when the decline of the Roman empire drew on by degrees the extinction of its language in several places, and its decay in all the western provinces, it became just and reasonable that each people should serve the Deity in the language they understood, and which was peculiar to them. This reasoning, however evident and striking, had no sort of influence upon the Roman pontiffs, who neither in this, nor in the following centuries, could be persuaded to change the established custom, but persisted, on the contrary, with the most senseless obstinacy, in retaining the use of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worship, even when it was no longer understood by the people [i]. This strange conduct has been variously accounted for by different writers, who have tortured their inventions to find out its secret reasons, and have imagined many that seem extremely improbable and far fetched. A superstitious and extravagant veneration for whatever carried the hoary aspect of a remote antiquity, was undoubtedly the principal reason that rendered the pontiffs unwilling to abolish the use of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worship. The same absurd principle produced a similar effect in the eastern churches; thus the Egyptian Christians perform their religious service in the

[b] BONA, *Rerum Liturgicar.* lib. i. cap. xi. p. 216.—LE BRUN, *loc. citat.* p. 292.—JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hist. de l'Espagne*, tom. iii. p. 237. 241. 246.

[i] USSERIUS, *Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis* ab HEN. WHARTONO edita et aucta, Londini 1690, in 4^{to}.

language of ancient Copts, the Jacobites and the Nestorians in the Syriac, and the Abyssinians in the old Æthiopic, though all these languages have been long since obsolete, and are thereby become absolutely unintelligible to the multitude [k].

III. It would be tedious to enumerate in a circumstantial manner the new inventions that were imposed upon Christians, in this century, under the specious titles of piety, and zeal, by the superstitious despotism of an imperious clergy. It would be also endless to mention the additions that were made to former inventions, the multiplication, for example, of the rites and ceremonies that were used in the worship of saints, relics, and images, and the new directions that were administered to such as undertook pilgrimages, or other superstitious services of that nature. We shall only observe, that, during the whole of this century, all the European nations were most diligently employed in rebuilding, repairing, and adorning their churches [l]. Nor will this appear surprising when we consider, that, in the preceding century, all *Europe* was alarmed with a dismal apprehension that the *day of judgment* was at hand, and that the world was approaching to its final dissolution; for, among the other effects of this panic terror, the churches and monasteries were suffered to fall into ruin, or at least to remain without repair, from a notion that they would soon be involved in the general fate of all sublunary things. But when these apprehensions were removed, things immediately put on a new face; the tottering temples were rebuilt, and the greatest zeal attended with the richest and most liberal donations, was employed in restoring the sacred edifices to their former lustre, or rather in giving them new degrees of magnificence and beauty.

Ceremonies
multiplied.

[k] See EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Dissertat. de Liturgiæ Oriental. origine et antiquitate*, cap. vi. p. 40.

[l] GLABER RODULPHUS, *Hist. lib. iii. cap. iv.* in DUCHESNE's *Scriptor. Franc.* tom. iv. p. 217. *Infra millesimum tertio jam fere imminente anno contigit in universo pæne terrarum orbe, præcipue tamen in Italia et in Galliis innovari Ecclesiarum basilicas.*

C H A P. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

Ancient sect.

I. **T**HE state of the ancient sects, and particularly of the Nestorians and Monophysites, who resided in *Asia* and *Egypt* under the Mahometan government, was now much the same that had been in the preceeding century, neither extremely prosperous, nor absolutely miserable. The case of the Manichæans, or Paulicians, whom the Grecian emperors had banished from the eastern provinces into *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, was much more unhappy, on account of the perpetual conflicts they had to sustain with the Greeks, who persecuted and oppressed them with much keenness and animosity. The Greeks, as usually happens upon like occasions, laid the blame of their violent measures upon the Manichæans, whom they represented as a turbulent, perfidious, and sanguinary faction, and as the declared and inveterate enemies of the Grecian empire [m]. This, however, is by no means to be received as an impartial state of the case; at least, it appears from many circumstances, that if the Manichæans were exasperated against the Greeks, their resentment was owing to the violent and injurious treatment they had received from them. The Grecian pontiffs and clergy were far from being destitute of the odious spirit of persecution, and it is certain that the emperors, instigated and set on by them, had exhausted the patience of the Paulicians by repeated cruelties and vexations, and alienated their affections by inflicting upon them, without interruption, a variety of punishments, such as banishment, confiscation of goods, and other such marks of severity and violence.

ALEXIUS COMNENUS, who, by his learning, was an

[m] ANNA COMNENA *Alexiados*, lib. v. p. 105. lib. vi. p. 124. 126. 145.

ornament to the imperial scepter, perceiving that the CENT. XI. Manichæans were not to be vanquished, without the greatest difficulty, by the force of arms, and observing also that their numbers increased from day to day both in *Thrace* and in the adjacent provinces, had recourse to the power of reason and argument to conquer their obstinacy, and spent whole days at *Philippopolis*, in disputing with the principal doctors of that pernicious sect. Many of them yielded to the victorious arguments of this royal disputant, and his learned associates; nor is this to be so much wondered at, since their demonstrations were accompanied and enforced by rewards and punishments. Such of the Manichæans, as retracted their errors and returned to the bosom of the Greek church, were loaded with gifts, honours, and privileges according to their respective stations, while such as stood firm against the reasoning of the emperor, were inhumanly condemned to perpetual imprisonment [n].

II. Many of the Paulicians, either from a principle of zeal for the propagation of their opinions, or from a desire of getting rid of the persecution and oppression they suffered under the Grecian yoke, retired from *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, and formed settlements in other countries. Their first migration was into *Italy*; from whence in process of time, they sent colonies into almost all the other provinces of *Europe*, and formed gradually a considerable number of religious assemblies who adhered to their doctrine, and who were afterwards persecuted with the utmost vehemence by the Roman pontiffs [o]. It is difficult

An account
of the Pauli-
cians in Eu-
rope.

[n] There is an ample and circumstantial account of this controversy between the emperor and the Manichæans in the work mentioned in the preceeding note, *Lib. xiv. p. 357.*

[o] See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiquitat. Ital. med. ævi*, tom. v. p. 83.—LIMBORCH, *Historia Inquisitionis*, p. 31.—THOM. AUG. RICHINII *Dissertatio de Catharis*, which is prefixed to the *SUMMA B. MONETÆ contra Catharos*, p. 17, 18. we might also refer upon this occasion to GLABR. RODULPH *Histor. lib. iii. cap. viii.* to MATTH. PARIS, and other ancient writers. Certain Italian authors, and among others RICHINI, seem unwilling to acknowledge, that the Paulicians arrived first in *Italy*, and proceeded from thence into the other provinces of *Europe*; and maintain, on the contrary, that their first settlement was in *France*, and that from thence they came into *Italy*. These writers

look

CENT. XI.

— difficult to fix the precise period of time, when the Paulicians began to take refuge in *Europe*; it is, however, undoubtedly certain from the most authentic testimonies, that a considerable number of that sect were, about the middle of this century, settled in *Lombardy*, *Insu-bria*, and principally at *Milan*; and that many of them led a wandering life in *France*, *Germany*, and other countries, where they captivated the esteem and admiration of the multitude by their sanctimonious looks, and the uncommon air of piety, which they put on with much affectation. In *Italy* they were called *Paterini* and *Cathari*, or rather *Gazari*, which latter appellation the Germans have preserved, with a small alteration only, which was proper to adapt it to the genius of their language [p]. In *France* they were called *Albigenses*, from the town of *Alby*, in the upper *Languedoc*, in Latin *Albigia* [q]. They were likewise called *Bulgarians* in *France*.

look upon it as ignominious to their country, to be considered as the first European nation which fostered such a pernicious and impious sect in its bosom. Be that as it may, their hypothesis is favoured by *PETR. DE MARCA* himself, a Frenchman, who, in his *Histoire de Bearn*, livr. viii. cap. xiv. p. 728. declares it as his opinion, that the Paulicians joined themselves to the Gallic armies, that returned from the holy war in *Palestine*, by the province of *Bulgaria*, and were thus conducted into *France*. But that learned author alledges no proof to support this opinion: it appears, on the contrary, from the records of the *Inquisition of Tholouse*, published by *LIMBORCH*, and from other authentic pieces, that the Paulicians settled first in *Sicily*, *Lombardy*, *Liguria*, and the *Milaneze*, and sent from thence their doctors and missionaries into *France*. See the *Codex Tolosanus*, p. 13, 14. 32. 68, 69. & *passim*. We learn also from the *Code of Tholouse*, that the French Paulicians, who were called *Albigenses*, had no bishop to consecrate their *Anciani* (such was the title they gave to their presbyters) so that such of them as were desirous of being placed in the order of presbyters, were obliged to repair to *Italy* in order to their being regularly installed.

[p] The title of *Paterini*, which was given to this sect in *Italy*, has been already explained in the 2d Chapter, of the 2d Part of this Century, Sect. 13, Note [r]. As to the term *Catharus*, it was, undoubtedly, when applied to the Paulicians, the same with *Gazarus*, as I have elsewhere demonstrated. See *Histor. Ord. Apostol.* p. 367. The country, which bore, in this century, the name of *Gazaria*, was what we now call the *Lesser Tartary*.

[q] That the Paulicians were called *Albigenses* in *France*, and were a sect

France, because they came from *Bulgaria*, and because CENT. XI. the head of their sect resided in that country; as also *Publicans*, which was probably a corrupt pronounciation of *Paulicians*, and *boni homines* or *good men*, with several other titles and epithets [r].

III. The first religious assembly which the Paulicians had formed in *Europe* is said to have been discovered at *Orleans*, in the year 1017, under the reign of ROBERT. The Manichæans of Orleans seem to have been Mystics. A certain Italian lady is said to have been at the head of this sect; its principal members were twelve canons of the cathedral of *Orleans*, men eminently distinguished by their piety and learning, among whom LISOSIUS and STEPHEN held the first rank; and it was composed, in general, of a considerable number of citizens, who were far from being of the meanest condition. The impious doctrines, professed by these canons, were discovered by a certain priest named HERIBERT, and by ARIFASTUS, a Norman nobleman, upon which ROBERT assembled a council at *Orleans*, and employed the most effectual me-

fect entirely distinct from the *Waldenses* and other heretics, appears evidently from the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*, already mentioned. They received this name from a town in *Aquitain*, called *Albigia*, or *Alby*, where their errors were condemned in a council held in the year 1176. See CHATEL, *Memoires de l'Histoire de Languedoc*, p. 305. It is, therefore, a mistake to consider the *Albigenses*, as a sect so called from *Alby's* being the place of their birth, their residence, or the seat of their principal assembly: since that name was given them for no other reason than their having been condemned in a council held in that town. There were, indeed, several Paulicians among the various sects of dissenters from the church of *Rome*, that inhabited the country about *Alby*: and it is also true, that the title of *Albigenses* is usually extended to all the heretics, of whatever sect or denomination they were, who dwelt in these parts.

[r] The learned DU FRESNE, in his *Glossarium Latin. medii ævi*, tom. 1. p. 1338. has proved in an ample manner, that the Paulicians were called, in *France*, *Bulgares*, and, by a corrupt pronounciation of that word, *Bougres*. The same author, in his *Observationes ad Villeharduini Historiam Constantinopolit.* p. 169. has fully demonstrated, that the names *Popolicani* and *Publicani*, that were imposed upon these Manichæans, were no more than a corruption of the term *Pauliciani* ill-pronounced. The appellation of *Boni Homines*, or *Los bos Homes*, as the southern French spoke at that time, was a title which the Paulicians attributed to themselves. See the *Codex Inquisit. Tolosanæ*. p. 22. 84. 95, &c. and more especially p. 131.

thods

CENT. XI. ————— thods that could be thought of to bring these heretics to a better mind. But all his endeavours were to no purpose; this pernicious sect adhered obstinately to their principles, and hence they were at length condemned to be burnt alive [s].

It is difficult to come to a fixed determination with respect to the character and doctrine of these people; for when we examine matters attentively we find, that even their enemies acknowledged the sincerity of their piety; that they were blackened by accusations which were evidently false; and that the opinions for which they were punished differ widely from the Manichæan system [t]. As far as we can see into the case, it appears to us, that these pretended Manichæans of *Orleans* were a set of *Mystics*, who looked with contempt upon all external worship, rejected all rites and ceremonies, and even the Christian sacraments, as destitute of any, even the least spiritual efficacy or virtue, placed the whole of religion in the internal contemplation of God, and the elevation of the soul to divine and celestial things, and in their philosophical speculations concerning God, the trinity, and the human soul, soared above the comprehension of the age in which they lived. A like set of men proceeded in vast numbers out of *Italy* in the following ages, spread like an inundation through all the European provinces, and were known in *Germany* under the name of the *Brethren of the free spirit*, while they were

[s] The accounts that the ancient writers have given of these heretics are collected by BOULAY, in his *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 364.

—CHARL. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collection. judicior. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 5. —JO. LAUNOY, *De Scholis Celebrioribus Caroli Magni*, cap. xxiv. p. 90. —The history of the synod of *Orleans*, in which this sect was condemned, is given by LUC. DACHERIUS, in his *Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 604.

[t] BASNAGE, in his *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i. period. iv. p. 97. and in his *Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 1388. pleads the cause of the canons of *Orleans*; but this learned and worthy man seems to have been carried too far by his zeal for augmenting the number of those who have been martyrs to the truth.

distinguish-

distinguished in other countries by the appellation of *Cent.XI.*
Beghards [u].

IV. We find in history another branch of this numerous sect, whose errors were not accompanied with the crimes that were laid to the charge of their brethren, and who were converted by a pathetic discourse that was addressed to them by GERHARD, bishop of *Cambray* and *Arras*, in an assembly of the clergy, that was held in the last of these two cities, A. D. 1030. These honest *Mystics*, who were equally remarkable for their docility and their ignorance, had received the doctrine they professed from the Italians, and particularly from a certain chimerical doctor, whose name was GUNDULF. They maintained in general, according to their own confession, that the whole of religion consisted in the study of practical piety and in a course of action conformable to the divine laws, and treated all external modes of worship with the utmost contempt. Their particular tenets may be reduced to the following heads: 1. They rejected baptism, and, in a more especial manner, the baptism of infants, as a ceremony that was in no respect essential to salvation. 2. They rejected, for the same reason, the sacrament of the Lord's supper. 3. They denied, that the churches were endowed with a greater degree of sanctity than private houses, or that they were more adapted to the worship of God than any other place. 4. They affirmed, that the altars were to be considered in no other light, than as heaps of stones, and were therefore unworthy of any marks of veneration or regard. 5. They disapproved of the use of incense and consecrated oil in services of a religious nature. 6. They

Another
branch of
that sect
converted by
Gerhard.

[u] We shall have occasion to give a fuller account of these fanatics in the history of the *XIIth* century, in which they were first drawn from their obscurity, and condemned in many councils, especially in *Germany*. It is, however, certain, that they had a clandestine existence long before that period, and that they propagated their tenets secretly in several places. Their doctrine resembles, in some particulars, that of *Manichæans*; and hence it was natural for the ignorant divines of the age in which they lived, to consider them as a branch of that pernicious sect.

looked

CENT. XI. looked upon the use of bells in the churches, as an intolerable superstition. 7. They denied, that the establishment of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and other ecclesiastical dignities was of divine institution, and went so far as to maintain that the appointment of stated ministers in the church was entirely needless. 8. They affirmed, that the institution of funeral rites was an effect of sacerdotal avarice, and that it was a matter indifference whether the dead were buried in the churches, or in the fields. 9. They looked upon those voluntary punishments, called *pennance*, which were so generally practised in this century, as unprofitable and absurd. 10. They denied, that the sins of departed spirits could be in any measure, atoned for, by the celebration of *masses*, the distribution of alms to the poor, or a *vicarious penance* [w], and they treated, of consequence, the doctrine of purgatory, as a ridiculous fable. 11. They considered marriage as a pernicious institution, and absurdly condemned without distinction all connubial bonds [x]. They looked upon a certain sort of veneration and worship as due to the *apostles* and *martyrs*, from which, however, they excluded such as were only *confessors*, in which class they comprehended the *saints*, who had not suffered death for the cause of CHRIST, and whose bodies, in their esteem, had nothing more sacred than any other human carcass. 13. They declared the use of instrumental music in the churches, and other religious assemblies, superstitious and unlawful. 14. They denied, that the cross on which CHRIST suffered was in any respect more sacred than other kinds of wood, and, of consequence, refuse to pay to it the smallest degree of religious worship. 15. They not only refused all acts of adoration to the images of CHRIST, and of the saints,

[(w) By a *vicarious penance* is understood the course of mortification and voluntary suffering, that one person undergoes in order to procure absolution for another.]

[x] This 11th article is scarcely credible, at least, as it is here expressed. It is more reasonable to suppose that these Mystics did not absolutely condemn marriage, but only held celibacy in higher esteem, as a mark of superior sanctity and virtue.

but

but were also for having them removed out of the churches. 16. They were shocked at the subordination and distinctions that were established among the clergy, and at the different degrees of authority that were conferred upon the different members of that sacred body [y].

When we consider the corrupt state of religion in this century, and particularly, the superstitious notions that were generally adopted in relation to outward ceremonies, the efficacy of penance and the sanctity of churches, relics, and images, it will not appear surprizing, that many persons of good sense and solid piety, running from one extreme to another, fell into the opinions of these Mystics, in which, among several absurdities, there were many things plausible and specious, and some highly rational.

V. A controversy, of a much more subtle and difficult nature, arose in *France* about the year 1089; and had for its principal author ROSCELLINUS, a canon of *Compiègne*, a profound dialectician, and the most eminent doctor of the sect called *Nominalists*, which we have already had occasion to mention in the course of this history. This subtle doctor held it inconceivable and impossible, that the son of God should take on the human nature alone, *i. e.* without the Father and the holy Ghost becoming incarnate also, unless by the three persons in the godhead were meant three distinct *objects*, or natures existing separately (such as three angels, or three distinct spirits) though endowed with one will, and acting by one power. When it was insinuated to ROSCELLINUS, that this manner of reasoning led directly to *Tritheism*, or the doctrine of three gods, he answered boldly: that the existence of three gods might be asserted with truth [z], were not

The controversy set on foot by Roscellinus.

[y] See an account of the synod of *Arras* in DACHERIUS, *Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter.* tom. i. p. 607.—624.—CAR. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 7.

[z] Such is the account given by JOHN, the accuser of this metaphysical ecclesiastic, in a letter to ANSELM, archbishop of *Canterbury*, published by BALUZIUS, in his *Miscellanea*, tom. iv. p. 478. The same account is confirmed by ANSELM himself, in the book *De Fide Trinitatis*, which he wrote against ROSCELLINUS, see *Oper.* tom. i. p.

CENT. XI. not the expression harsh and contrary to the phraseology generally received. He was, however, obliged to retract this error in a council assembled at *Soissons*, in the

41. 43. & lib. ii. *Epistolar. ep. xxxv. p. 355. tom. ii. Opp.*—And also by *FULCO*, bishop of *Beauvais*, as may be seen in the 2d book of the *Epistles* of *ANSELM*, ep. lix. lib. ii. tom. ii. *Opp. p. 357*—It must, however, be considered, that the learned men now mentioned were the inveterate enemies of *ROSCCELLINUS*, and that they perhaps comprehended his meaning imperfectly, or perverted it willingly. Several circumstances prove that some of his adversaries were in one or the other of these two cases. *ANSELM*, himself, furnishes sufficient grounds for this suspicion, since, notwithstanding his aversion to the *Nominalists*, of whom *ROSCCELLINUS* was the chief, he grants, in his book *De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. iii. p. 44. that the opinion of his antagonist may be admitted, or at least tolerated, in a certain sense, and even frequently intimates that he is not perfectly assured of his understanding fully the meaning of *ROSCCELLINUS*, and that he believes the sentiments of that ecclesiastic less pernicious than his accusers have represented them. *Sed forsitan* (says *ANSELM*) *ipse (ROSCCELLINUS) non dicit, sicut sunt tres anime aut tres Angeli: sed ille, qui mihi ejus mandavit questionem, hanc ex suo posuit similitudinem: sed solummodo tres personas affirmat esse TRES, sine additamento alicujus similitudinis.* The same *ANSELM* (*Epistolar. lib. ii. ep. xli. p. 357.*) declares, that the account which he had received of the opinions of *ROSCCELLINUS* appears to him extremely dubious, *Quod tamen* (says he) *absque dubietate credere non possum.* From all this it is evident, that *ANSELM* was far from having an entire confidence in the equity and impartiality of the accusers of *ROSCCELLINUS*, or from looking upon that ecclesiastic so black, as his enemies had endeavoured to make him.

As to the merits of the cause, it appears manifest to me, that this subtle dispute was a consequence of the warm controversy, that subsisted, in this century, between the *Realists* and the *Nominalists*. The former attacked the latter by the dangerous conclusions that seemed deducible from their principles, and reasoned thus: “If, as your doctrine supposes, *universal substances* are no more than mere *sounds* or *denominations*, and the whole science of logic is only conversant about words, it must of necessity follow, that the three persons in the Godhead, are only three *NAMES*, and not three *REALITIES* OR *THINGS*. We deny the conclusion, replied *ROSCCELLINUS*; the father, son, and holy ghost, are not placed by us in the rank of *DENOMINATIONS*, but in the class of *REALITIES* OR *THINGS*.” The subtle doctor here, as all must more or less do after him, by avoiding *Scylla* fell into *Charybdis*, and was charged, by his adversaries, with the introduction of tritheism, by holding an opinion, that supposed the existence of three divine substances. Were any of the writings of *ROSCCELLINUS* now extant, they would help us, no doubt, to form a juster notion of this controversy than we can have at present

year 1092 ; but he resumed it when the council was dismissed, and the danger over. Persecuted anew on account of this doctrine, he took refuge in *England*, and excited there, divisions and contests of another kind, by maintaining, among other things, that persons born out of lawful wedlock ought to be deemed incapable of admission to holy orders. This doctrine, which was by no means suited to the times, procured ROSCELLINUS many enemies, and was in a great measure, the occasion of his involuntary removal from *England*. Banished thence, he returned to *France*, and, taking up his residence at *Paris*, he fomented again the old dispute concerning the trinity. This, however, succeeded not according to his hopes, but exposed him to much trouble and vexation from the redoubled attacks of his adversaries, who pressed hard on him from all quarters. Fatigued with their persecutions, he retired at last to *Aquitain*, where he acquired universal esteem by his eminent piety, and passed the rest of his days in tranquillity and repose [a].

[a] BOULAY *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 485. 489.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. v. p. 262.—*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 358.—ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, ad A. 1094. tom. iv. p. 317.—JACQUES LONGUEVAL, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane*. tom. viii. p. 59.

THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. I.
XII.

Several of
the northern
provinces re-
ceive the
light of the
gospel.

A CONSIDERABLE part of *Europe* lay yet involved in Pagan darkness, which reigned more especially in the northern provinces. It was, therefore, in these regions of gloomy superstition, that the zeal of the missionaries was principally exerted in this century; though their efforts were not all equally successful, nor the methods they employed for the propagation of the gospel equally prudent. BOLESLAUS, duke of *Poland*, having conquered the Pomeranians, offered them peace upon condition that they would receive the Christian doctors, and permit them to exercise their ministry in that vanquished province. This condition was accepted, and ORTHO, bishop of *Bamberg*, a man of eminent piety and zeal, was sent, in the year 1124, to inculcate and explain the doctrines of Christianity among that superstitious and barbarous people. Many were converted to the faith by his ministry, while great numbers stood firm against his most vigorous efforts, and persisted with an invincible obstinacy in the religion of their idolatrous ancestors. Nor was this the only mortification, which that illustrious prelate received in the execution of his pious enterprize; for, upon his return into *Germany*, many of those, whom he had engaged

ed in the profession of Christianity, apostatized in his absence, and relapsed into their ancient prejudices; this obliged OTHO to undertake a second voyage into *Pomerania*, A. D. 1126, in which, after much opposition and difficulty, his labours were crowned with a happier issue, and contributed much to enlarge the bounds of the rising church, and to establish it upon solid foundations [a]. From this period, the Christian religion seemed to acquire daily new degrees of stability among the Pomeranians; who could not be persuaded hitherto to permit the settlement of a bishop among them, but now received ADAUBERT, or ALBERT, in that character, who was accordingly the first bishop of *Pomerania*.

C E N T.
XII.

II. Of all the northern princes in this century, none appeared with a more distinguished lustre than WALDEMAR I, king of *Denmark*, who acquired an immortal name by the glorious battles he fought against the Pagan nations, such as the Slavonians, Venedi, Vandals, and others, who either by their incursions, or this revolt, drew upon them the weight of his victorious arm. He unsheathed his sword not only for the defence and happiness of his people, but also for the propagation and advancement of Christianity; and wherever his arms were successful, there he pulled down the temples and images of the gods, destroyed their altars, laid waste their sacred groves, and substituted in their place the Christian worship, which deserved to be propagated by better means than the sword, by the authority of reason, rather than by the despotic voice of power. The island of *Rugen*, which lies in the neighbourhood of *Pomerania*, submitted to the victorious arms of WALDEMAR, A. D. 1168; and its fierce and savage inhabitants, who

The Slavonians and inhabitants of the isle of *Rugen*.

[a] See HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 34. where we find the life of OTHO, who, A. D. 1189, was canonised by CLEMENT III. See the *Acta Sanctor. mensis Julii*, tom. i. p. 349.—DAN. CRAMERI *Chronicon Eccles. Pomeraniæ*, lib. i. as also a learned *Dissertation* concerning the conversion of the Pomeranians by the ministry of OTHO, written in the German language by CHRISTOPHER SCHOTGEN, and published at *Stargard* in the year 1724. Add to these, MABILLON *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 123. 146. 323.

CENT.
XII.

were, in reality, no more than a band of robbers and pirates, were obliged, by that prince, to hear the instructions of the pious and learned doctors that followed his army, and to receive the Christian worship. This salutary work was brought to perfection by ABSALOM, archbishop of *Lunden*, a man of a superior genius, and of a most excellent character in every respect, whose eminent merit raised him to the summit of power, and engaged WALDEMAR to place him at the head of affairs [b].

The Finlanders.

III. The Finlanders received the gospel in the same manner, in which it had been propagated among the inhabitants of the isle of *Rugen*. They were also a fierce and savage people, who lived by plunder, and infested *Sweden* in a terrible manner by their perpetual incursions, until, after many bloody battles, they were totally defeated by ERIC IX, and were, in consequence thereof reduced under the Swedish yoke. Historians differ about the precise time when this conquest was compleated [c]; but they are all unanimous in their accounts of its effects. The Finlanders were commanded to embrace the religion of the conqueror, which the greatest part of them did, though with the utmost re-

[b] SAXO GRAMMATICUS, *Histor. Danic.* lib. xiv. p. 239.—HELMOLDUS, *Chron. Slavorum.* lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 234. & HENR. BANGERTUS, *ad b. l.*—PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ*, tom. i. p. 404.

[Besides the historians here mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM, we refer the curious reader to an excellent history of *Denmark*, written in French by M. MALLET, professor at *Copenhagen*. In the first volume of this history, the ingenious and learned author has given a very interesting account of the progress of Christianity in the northern parts of *Europe*, and a particular relation of the exploits of ABSALOM, who was, at the same time, archbishop, general, admiral, and prime minister, and who led the victorious Danes to battle by sea and land without neglecting the cure of souls, or diminishing, in the least, his pious labours in the propagation of the gospel abroad, and its maintenance and support at home.]

[c] Most writers with BARONIUS place this event in the year 1157. Different, however, from this is the chronology of VASTOVIUS and OERNHIELMIUS, the former placing it A. D. 1150, and the latter A. D. 1157.

Influence

luciance [d]. The founder and ruler of this new church was HENRY, archbishop of *Upsal*, who accompanied the victorious monarch in that bloody campaign. This prelate, whose zeal was not sufficiently tempered with the mild and gentle spirit of the religion he taught, treated the new converts with great severity, and was assassinated at last in a cruel manner on account of the heavy penance he imposed upon a person of great authority, who had been guilty of manslaughter. This melancholy event procured HENRY the honours of sainthood and martyrdom, which were solemnly conferred upon him by pope ADRIAN IV [e].

IV. The propagation of the gospel among the Livonians was attended with much difficulty, and also with horrible scenes of cruelty and bloodshed. The first missionary, who attempted the conversion of that savage people, was MAINARD, a regular canon of *St. Augustin*, in the monastery of *Sigeberg*, who, towards the conclusion of this century [f], travelled to *Livonia*, with a company of merchants of *Bremen* who traded thither, and improved this opportunity of spreading the light of the gospel in that barbarous region of superstition and darkness. The instructions and exhortations of this zealous apostle were little attended to, and produced little or no effect upon that uncivilized nation; whereupon he addressed himself to the Roman pontiff, URBAN III, who consecrated him bishop of the Livonians, and, at the same time, declared a holy war against that obstinate people. This war, which was at first carried on against the inhabitants of the province of *Esthonia*, was continued with still greater vigour and rendered more universal by BERTHOLD, abbot of *Lucca*, who left his monastery to share the labours and laurels of MAINARD,

[d] OERNHIELMII *Histor. Eccles. gentis Suecorum*, lib. iv. cap. iv. § 13. — JO. LOCCENII *Histor. Suecica*, lib. iii. p. 76. ed. *Francof.* — ERLANDI *Vita Erici Sancti*, cap. vii. — VASTOVII *Vitis Aquilonia*, p. 65.

[e] VASTOVII *Vitis Aquilon. seu Vitæ Sanctorum regni Suegothici*, p. 62. — ERIC. BENZELII *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Suegothicæ*, part. I. p. 33.

[f] In the year 1186.

CENT.
XII.

whom he, accordingly, succeeded in the see of *Livonia*. The new bishop marched into that province, at the head of a powerful army which he had raised in *Saxony*, preached the gospel sword in hand, and proved its truth by blows; instead of arguments. ALBERT, canon of *Bremen*, became the third bishop of *Livonia*, and followed, with a barbarous enthusiasm, the same military methods of conversion that had been practised by his predecessor. He entered *Livonia*, A. D. 1198, with a fresh body of troops, drawn out of *Saxony*, and encamping at *Riga*, instituted there, by the direction of the Roman pontiff INNOCENT III, the *military order of the knights sword-bearers* [g] who were commissioned to dragoon the Livonians into the profession of Christianity, and to oblige them, by force of arms, to receive the benefits of baptism [h]. New legions were sent from *Germany* to second the efforts, and add efficacy to the mission of these booted apostles; and they, together with the knights sword-bearers so cruelly oppressed, slaughtered and tormented this wretched people, that, exhausted, at length, and unable to stand any longer firm against the arm of of persecution strengthened still by new accessions of power, they abandoned the statues of their Pagan deities, and substituted in their place the images of the saints. But while they received the blessings of the gospel, they were, at the same time, deprived of all earthly comforts; for their lands and possessions were taken from them with the most odious circumstances of cruelty and violence, and the knights and bishops divided the spoil [i].

The Slavonians.

V. None of the northern nations had a more rooted aversion to the Christians, and a more obstinate antipa-

[g] *Equestris Ordo Militum Ensisferorum.*

[h] See HENR. LEONH. SCHURZFLEISCHII *Historia Ordinis Ensisferorum Equitum.* Wittenberg 1701, 8vo.

[i] See the *Origines Livoniæ, seu Chronicon vetus Livonicum*, published in folio, at *Frankfort*, in the year 1740, by JO. DANIEL GRUBERUS, and enriched with ample and learned observations, and notes, in which the laborious author enumerates all the writers of the Livonian history, and corrects their mistakes.

thy to their religion, than the Sclavonians, a rough and barbarous people, who inhabited the coast of the Baltic sea. This excited the zeal of several neighbouring princes, and of a multitude of pious missionaries, who united their efforts in order to conquer the prejudices of this people, and to open their eyes upon the light of the gospel. HENRY, duke of Saxony, surnamed the Lion, distinguished himself, in a particular manner, by the ardour which he discovered in the execution of this pious design, as well as by the wise methods he employed to render it successful. Among other measures that were proper for this purpose, he restored from their ruins, and endowed richly three bishoprics [k] that had been ravaged and destroyed by these Barbarians; to wit, the bishoprics of Ratzebourg and Schwerin, and that of Oldenbourg, which was afterwards transplanted to Lubec. The most eminent of the Christian doctors, who attempted the conversion of the Sclavonians was VICELINUS, a native of Hamelen, a man of extraordinary merit, who surpassed almost all his contemporaries in genuine piety and solid learning, and who, after having presided many years in the society of the regular canons of St. Augustin at Falderen, was, at length, consecrated bishop of Oldenbourg. This excellent man had employed the last thirty years of his life [l], amidst numberless vexations,

[(k) Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this matter is very different from that which is given by FLEURY, who asserts, that it was HARTWICK, archbishop of Bremen, who restored the three ruined sees, and consecrated VICELINUS, bishop of Oldenbourg; and that having done this without addressing himself to HENRY, that prince seized the tithes of VICELINUS, until a reconciliation was afterwards brought about between the offended prince and the worthy bishop. See FLEURY *Hist. Eccles.* livr. lxix. p. 665. 668. edit. Brux. FLEURY, in this and other parts of his history, shews, that he is but indifferently versed in the history of Germany, and has not drawn from the best sources. The authorities which Dr. MOSHEIM produces for his account of the matter, are, the *Origines Guelficæ*, tom. iii. p. 16. 19. 34. 55. 61. 63. 72. 82. with the celebrated *Preface* of SCHEIDIUS, § xiv. p. 41.—LUDEWIG's *Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum*, tom. vi. p. 230.—JO. ERN. DE WESTPHALEN, *Monumenta inedita rerum Cimbricarum et Megapolens.* tom. ii. p. 1998.]

[l] That is from the year 1124 to the year 1154, in which he died.

CENT.
XII.

dangers, and difficulties, in instructing the Sclavonians and exhorting them to comply with the invitations of the gospel of CHRIST; and as his pious labours were directed by true wisdom, and carried on with the most indefatigable industry and zeal, so were they attended with much fruit, even among that fierce and untractable people. Nor was his ministry among the Sclavonians the only circumstance that redounds to the honour of his memory; the history of his life and actions in general, furnish proofs of his piety and zeal, sufficient to transmit his name to the latest generations [m].

The judgment we ought to form of these conversions.

VI. It is needless to repeat here the observation we have had so often occasion to make upon such conversions as these we have been now relating, or to advertise the reader that the savage nations, who were thus dragooned into the church, became the disciples of CHRIST, not so much in reality, as in outward appearance. [They professed, with an inward reluctance, a religion which was inculcated by violence and bloodshed, which recalled to their remembrance nothing but scenes of desolation and misery, and which, indeed, when considered in the representations that were given of it by the greatest part of the missionaries, was but a few degrees removed from the absurdities of paganism.] The pure and rational religion of the gospel was never presented to these unhappy nations in its native simplicity; they were only taught to appease the Deity, and to render him propitious by a senseless round of trifling ceremonies and bodily exercises, which, in many circumstances, resembled the superstitions they were obliged to renounce, and might have been easily reconciled with them, had it not been that the name and history of CHRIST, the sign of the cross, and some diversity between certain rites

[m] There is a particular and ample account of VICELINUS, in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MOLLERUS, tom. ii. p. 910. and in the *Res Hamburg.* of LAMBECIUS, lib. ii. p. 12. See also upon this subject the *Origines Neomonaſter, et Bordeſholmenſ.* of the most learned and industrious JOH. ERN. DE WESTPHALEN, which are published in the 2d tome of the *Monumenta inedita Cimbrica*, p. 2344. and the *Preface* to this tome, p. 33. There is in this work a print of VICELINUS well engraven.

and ceremonies of the two religions opposed this coalition. Besides, the missionaries, whose zeal for imposing the name of Christians upon this people was so vehement and even furious, were extremely indulgent in all other respects, and opposed their prejudices and vices with much gentleness and forbearance. They permitted them to retain several rites and observances that were in direct opposition to the spirit of Christianity, and to the nature of true piety. The truth of the matter seems to have been this, that the leading views of these Christian heralds, and propagators of the faith, a small number excepted, were rather turned towards the advancement of their own interests, and the confirming and extending the dominion of the Roman pontiffs, than towards the true conversion of these savage Pagans, that conversion which consists in the removal of ignorance, the correction of error, and the reformation of vice.

CENT.
XII.

VII. A great revolution in *Asiatic Tartary*, which borders upon *Cathay*, changed the face of things in that distant region about the commencement of this century, and proved, by its effects, extremely beneficial to the Christian cause. Towards the conclusion of the preceding century, died COIREMCHAN, otherwise called KENCHAM, the most powerful monarch that was known in the eastern regions of *Asia*; and while that mighty kingdom was deprived of its chief, it was invaded, with such uncommon valour and success, by a Nestorian priest, whose name was JOHN, that it fell before his victorious arms, and acknowledged this warlike and enterprizing *presbyter*, as its monarch. This was the famous PRESTER JOHN, whose territory was, for a long time, considered by the Europeans as a second paradise, as the seat of opulence and complete felicity. As he was a *presbyter* before his elevation to the royal dignity, many continued to call him *presbyter John*, even when he was seated on the throne [n]; but his kingly name was

The state of
affairs in Tar-
tary changes
in favour of
the Christi-
ans.

UNG-

[n] The account I have here given of this famous *presbyter*, commonly called PRESTER JOHN, who was, for a long time, considered

CENT.
XII.

UNGCHAN. The high notions, the Greeks and Latins generally entertained of the grandeur and magnificence of this royal presbyter, were principally owing to the letters he wrote to the Roman emperors FREDERIC I,

as the greatest and happiest of all earthly monarchs, is what appeared to me the most probable among the various relations that have been given of the life and adventures of that extraordinary man. This account is moreover confirmed by the testimonies of cotemporary writers, whose knowledge and impartiality render them worthy of credit: such as WILLIAM of Tripoli (see DU FRESNE'S *Adnot. ad vitam Ludovici Sti à Joinvillio scriptam*, p. 89.) as also a certain bishop of Gabala, mentioned by OTTO Frising. *Chronic.* lib. vii. cap. xxxiii. See also GUILLAUME RUBRUQUIS *Voyage*, cap. xviii. p. 36. in the *Antiqua in Asiam Itinera* collected by fath. BERGERON. and ALBERIC. in *Chronico ad A. 1165 & 1170*, in LEIBNITII *Accessionibus Historicis*, tom. ii. p. 345. 355. It is indeed surprizing, that such authentic records as these should have escaped the observation of the learned, and that so many different opinions should have been advanced concerning PRESTER JOHN, and the place of his residence. But it is too generally the fate of learned men, to overlook those accounts that carry the plainest marks of evidence, and from a passion for the *marvellous* to plunge into the regions of uncertainty and doubt. In the xvth century, JOHN II, king of Portugal, employed PEDRO COUVILLIANO in a laborious inquiry into the real situation of the kingdom of PRESTER JOHN. The curious voyager undertook this task, and, for information in the matter, travelled with a few companions into *Abyssinia*; and observing in the emperor of the Abyssinians, or Ethiopians, many circumstances that resembled the accounts which, at that time, prevailed in *Europe* concerning PRESTER JOHN, he persuaded himself that he had fulfilled his commission, and found out the residence of that extraordinary monarch, who was the object of his researches. His opinion gained easily credit in *Europe*, which had not as yet emerged out of its ignorance and barbarism. See MORINUS, *De sacris Eccles. Ordinationibus*, part. II. p. 367. But a new light was cast upon this matter in the xviiith century, by the publication of several pieces which the industry of the curious drew forth from their obscurity, and by which a great number of learned men were engaged to abandon the Portuguese opinion, and were convinced that PRESTER JOHN reigned in *Asia*, though they still continued to dispute about the situation of his kingdom, and other particular circumstances. There are, notwithstanding all this, some men of the most eminent learning in our times, who maintain, that JOHN was emperor of the Abyssinians, and thus prefer the Portuguese opinion, though destitute of authentic proofs and testimonies, to the other above-mentioned, though supported by the strongest evidence, and the most unquestionable authorities. See EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Hist. Patriarch, Alexand.* p. 223. 337. — JOS. FRANC. LAFITAU, *Hist. des Decouvertes des Portugais*, tom. i. p. 58. & tom. iii. p. 57. — HENR. LE GRAND, *Diss. de Jobanne Presbytero* in LOBO'S *Voyage d' Abissinie*, tom. i. p. 295.

and

and to EMANUEL emperor of the Greeks, in which puffed up with prosperity and flushed with success, he vaunts his victories over the neighbouring nations that disputed his passage to the throne, describes in the most pompous and extravagant terms, the splendor of his riches, the grandeur of his state, and the extent of his dominions, and exalts himself far above all other earthly monarchs. All this was easily believed, and the Nestorians were extremely zealous in confirming the boasts of their vain glorious prince. He was succeeded by his son, or as others think, his brother, whose name was DAVID, though, in common discourse, he was also called PRESTER JOHN, as his predecessor had been. The reign of DAVID was far from being happy, nor did he end his days in peace; GENGHIZ KAN, the great and warlike emperor of the Tartars, invaded his territories towards the conclusion of this century, and deprived him both of his life and his dominions.

CENT.
XII.

VIII. The new kingdom of *Jerusalem*, which had been erected by the *holy warriors* of *France* towards the conclusion of the preceding century; seemed to flourish considerably at the beginning of this, and to rest upon firm and solid foundations. This prosperous scene was, however, but transitory, and was soon succeeded by the most terrible calamities and desolations. For when the Mahometans saw vast numbers of those that had engaged in this holy war returning into *Europe* and the Christian chiefs that remained in *Palestine* divided into factions, and advancing, every one his private interest without any regard to the public good, they resumed their courage, recovered from the terror and consternation into which they had been thrown by the amazing valour and rapid success of the European legions, and gathering troops and soliciting succours from all quarters, they harassed and exhausted the Christians by invasions and wars without interruption. The Christians, on the other hand, sustained their efforts with their usual fortitude, and maintained their ground during many years; but

The affairs
of the Christians in *Palestine* in a declining state.

CENT.
XII.

but when *Atabec Zenghi* [o], after a long siege, made himself master of the city of *Edeffa*, and threatened *Antioch* with the same fate, their courage began to fail, and a diffidence in their own strength obliged them to turn their eyes once more towards *Europe*. They accordingly implored, in the most lamentable strain, the assistance of the European princes, and requested that a new army of cross-bearing champions might be sent to support their tottering empire in the Holy land. Their entreaties were favourably received by the Roman pontiffs, who left no method of persuasion unemployed, that might engage the emperor and other Christian princes to execute a new expedition into *Palestine*.

The crusade
renewed.

IX. This new expedition was not, however, resolved upon with such unanimity and precipitation as the former had been; it was the subject of long deliberation, and its expediency was keenly debated both in the cabinets of princes, and in the assemblies of the clergy and the people. BERNARD, the famous abbot of *Clairval*, a man of the boldest resolution and of the greatest authority, put an end to these disputes under the pontificate of EUGENIUS III, who had been his disciple and who was wholly governed by his counsels. This eloquent and zealous ecclesiastic *preached the cross*, i. e. the *crusade*, in *France* and *Germany*, with great ardour and success; and in the grand parliament assembled at *Vezelai*, A. D. 1146, at which LEWIS VII, king of *France*, with his queen, and a prodigious concourse of the principal nobility, were present, BERNARD recommended this holy expedition with such a persuasive power, and declared with such assurance, that he had a divine commission to foretel its glorious success, that the king, the queen, and all the nobles immediately put on the military cross, and prepared themselves for the voyage in-

[o] *Atabeck* was a title of honour given by the *Sultans* to the viceroys or lieutenants, whom they intrusted with the government of their provinces. The Latin authors, who have wrote the history of this holy war, and of whom BONGARSIVS has given us a complete list, call this *Atabeck Zenghi*, SANGVINUS. See HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* at the word ATABECK, p. 142.

to *Palestine*. CONRAD III, emperor of *Germany*, was, CENT.
XII.
for some time, unmoved by the exhortations of BERNARD, but he was soon gained over by the urgent solicitations of the fervent abbot, and followed, accordingly, the example of the French monarch. The two princes, each at the head of a numerous army, set out for *Palestine*, to which they were to march by different roads. But, before their arrival in the holy land, the greatest part of their forces were melted away, and perished miserably, some by famine, some by the sword of the Mahometans, some by shipwreck, and a considerable number by the perfidious cruelty of the Greeks, who looked upon the western nations as more to be feared than the Mahometans themselves. LEWIS VII, left his kingdom A. D. 1147, and, in the month of March of the following year, he arrived at *Antioch*, with the wretched remains of his army, exhausted and dejected by the hardships they had endured. CONRAD set out also in the year 1147, in the month of May, and, in November following, he arrived at *Nice*, where he joined the French army, after having lost the greatest part of his own by calamities of various kinds. From *Nice* the two princes proceeded to *Jerusalem* A. D. 1148, from whence they led back into *Europe*, the year following, the miserable handful of troops, which had survived the disasters they met within this expedition. Such was the unhappy issue of this second *crusade*, which was rendered ineffectual by a variety of causes, but more particularly, by the jealousies and divisions that reigned among the Christian chiefs in *Palestine*. Nor was it more ineffectual in *Palestine* than it was detrimental to *Europe*, by draining the wealth of its fairest provinces, and destroying such a prodigious number of its inhabitants [p].

X. The

[p] Besides the historians enumerated by BONGARSIIUS, see MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 399. 404. 407. 417. 451. JAC. GERVASII *Histoire de l'Abbé Suger*, tom. iii. p. 104. 128, 173. 190. 239. This was the famous SUGER, abbot of *St. Denis*, who had seconded the exhortations of BERNARD in favour of the *crusade*, and whom

CENT.
XII.The king-
dom of Je-
rusalem over-
turned.

X. The unhappy issue of this second expedition was not however sufficient, when considered alone, to render the affairs of the Christians, in *Palestine*, entirely desperate. Had their chiefs and princes laid aside their animosities and contentions, and attacked the common enemy with their united force, they would have soon repaired their losses, and recovered their glory. But this was far from being the case. A fatal corruption of sentiments and manners reigned among all ranks and orders. Both the people and their leaders, and more especially the latter, abandoned themselves without reluctance to all the excesses of ambition, avarice, and injustice; they indulged themselves in the practice of all sorts of vices, and by their intestine quarrels, jealousies, and discords, they weakened their efforts against the enemies that surrounded them on all sides, and consumed their strength by thus unhappily dividing it. SALADIN, viceroy, or rather sultan, of *Egypt* and *Syria* [*q*], and the most valiant chief of whom the Mahometan annals boast, took advantage of these lamentable divisions. He waged war against the Christians with the utmost valour and success; took prisoner GUY of LUSIGNAN, king of *Jerusalem*, in a fatal battle fought near *Tiberias*, A. D. 1187; and, in the course of the same year, reduced *Jerusalem* itself under his dominion [*r*]. The

whom LEWIS appointed regent of *France* during his absence. VERTOT, *Histoire des Chevaliers de Malte*, tom. i. p. 86. JOH. JAC. MASCOVIUS, *De rebus imperii sub Conrado III.*

[(*q*) SALADIN, so called by the western writers, and SALAH'ADDIN by the Orientals, was no longer vizir or viceroy of *Egypt*, when he undertook the siege of *Jerusalem*, but had usurped the sovereign power in that country, and had also added to his dominions, by right of conquest, several provinces of *Syria*.]

[*r*] See the *Life of Saladin* by BOHAO'DDIN EBN SHEDDAD, an Arabian writer, whose history of that warlike sultan was published at *Leyden*, in the year 1732, by the late celebrated professor ALBERT SCULTENS, and accompanied with an excellent Latin translation. See also HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* at the article SALAH'ADDIN, p. 742. and MARIGNY'S *Histoire des Arabes*, tom. iv. p. 289. [But above all, see the learned *History of the Arabians* in the *Modern Part of the Universal History*.]

carnage

carnage and desolations that accompanied this dreadful campaign threw the affairs of the Christians in the east into the most desperate condition, and left them no glimpse of hope, but what arose from the expected succours of the European princes. These succours were obtained for them by the Roman pontiffs with much difficulty, and in consequence of repeated solicitations and entreaties. But the event, as we shall now see, was by no means answerable to the deep schemes that were concerted, and the pains that were employed for the support of the tottering kingdom of *Jerusalem*.

XI. The third expedition was undertaken, A. D. 1189, by FREDERIC I, surnamed BARBAROSSA, emperor of *Germany*, who, with a prodigious army, marched through several Grecian provinces, where he had innumerable difficulties and obstacles to overcome, into the *Lesser Asia*, from whence, after having defeated the sultan of *Iconium*, he penetrated into *Syria*. His valour and conduct promised successful and glorious campaigns to the army he commanded, when, by an unhappy accident he lost his life in the river *Saleph* [s], which runs through *Seleucia*. The manner of his death is not known with any degree of certainty; the loss however of such an able chief dejected the spirits of his troops, so that considerable numbers of them returned into *Europe*. Those that remained, continued the war under the command of FREDERIC, son of the deceased emperor; but the greatest part of them perished miserably by a pestilential disorder which raged with prodigious violence in the camp, and swept off vast numbers every day. The new general died of this terrible disease A. D. 1191; those that escaped its fury

A third crusade undertaken.

[(i) MAIMBOURG, in his *Histoire des Croisades*, and MARIGNI, in his *Hist. du XII Siècle*, say, that FREDERIC perished in the *Cydnus*, a river in *Cilicia*. But they are easily to be reconciled with our author, as, according to the descriptions given of the river *Saleph* by several learned geographers, and among others by ROGER the Anna-list, it appears that the *Saleph* and the *Cydnus* were the same river under different names.]

were

CENT.
XII.

Its issue.

were dispersed, and few returned to their own country [i].

XII. The example of FREDERIC BARBAROSSA was followed, in the year 1190, by PHILIP AUGUSTUS king of *France*, and lion hearted RICHARD, king of *England*. These two monarchs set out from their respective dominions with a considerable number of ships of war and transports [u], arrived in *Palestine* in the year 1191, each at the head of a separate army, and were pretty successful in their first encounters with the infidels. After the reduction of the strong city of *Acca* or *Ptolemais*, which had been defended by the Moslems with the most obstinate valour, the French monarch returned into *Europe*, in the month of July, 1191, leaving, however, behind him a considerable part of the army which he had conducted into *Palestine*. After his departure, the king of *England* pushed the war with the greatest vigour, gave daily marks of his heroic intrepidity and military skill, and not only defeated SALADIN in several engagements, but also made himself master of *Yaffa* [w] and *Cæsarea*. Deserted however, by the French and Italians, and influenced by other motives and considerations of the greatest weight, he concluded, A. D. 1192, with SALADIN a truce of three years, three months, and as many days, and soon after evacuated *Palestine* with his whole army [x]. Such was the issue of the third expedition against the infidels, which exhausted *England*, *France*, and *Germany* both of men and money, without bringing any solid advantage, or giving

[i] See an ample and satisfactory account of this unhappy campaign in the *Life of Frederic I*, written in German by HENRY Count BUNAU, p. 278. 293. 309.

[(u) The learned authors of the *Modern Universal History* tell us, that PHILIP arrived in *Palestine* with a supply of men, money, &c. on board *six ships*, whereas RENAUDOT mentions 100 sail as employed in this expedition. The fleet of RICHARD consisted of 150 large ships, besides galleys, &c.]

[w] More commonly known by the name of *Joppa*.

[x] DANIEL, *Histoire de France*, tom. iii. p. 426.—RAPIN THOYRAS, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. See there the reign of RICHARD, *Cœur de Lion*.—MARIGNY, *Histoire des Arabes*, tom. iv. p. 285.

even

even a favourable turn to the affairs of the Christians C E N T. XII.
in the Holy land.

XIII. These bloody wars between the Christians and Mahometans gave rise to *three famous military orders*, whose office it was to destroy the robbers that infested the public roads, to harass the Moslems by perpetual inroads and warlike achievements, to assist the poor and sick pilgrims, whom the devotion of the times conducted to the holy sepulchre, and to perform several other services that tended to the general good [y]. The first of these orders was that of the *knights of St. John of Jerusalem*, who derived their name, and particularly that of *Hospitallers* from an hospital dedicated, in that city, to St. JOHN the *baptist*, in which certain pious and charitable brethren were constantly employed in relieving and refreshing with necessary supplies the indigent and diseased pilgrims, who were daily arriving at *Jerusalem*. When this city became the metropolis of a new kingdom, the revenues of the hospital, were so prodigiously encreased by the liberality of several princes and the pious donations of such opulent persons as frequented the *holy places*, that they far surpassed the wants of those whom they were designed to cherish and relieve. Hence it was that RAYMOND DU PUY, who was the ruler of this charitable house, offered to the king of *Jerusalem* to make war upon the Mahometans at his own expence, seconded by his brethren, who served under him in this famous hospital. BALDUIN II, to whom this proposal was made, accepted it readily, and the enterprize was solemnly approved of and confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontiff. Thus all of a sudden, the world was surprized with the strange transformation of a devout fraternity, who had lived remote from the noise and tumult of arms in the performance of works of charity and mercy, into a valiant and hardy band of warriors. The whole Order was upon this occasion divided into three classes; the first contained the *knights*, or soldiers of illustrious birth, who

Institution
of the mili-
tary order of
knighthood.

[y] The writers, who have given the history of these three orders, are enumerated by Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* p. 465. but his enumeration is not complete.

C E N T. XII. were to unsheath their swords in the Christian cause; in the second were comprehended the *priests*, who were to officiate in the churches that belonged to the order; and in the third, the *serving brethren*, or the soldiers of low condition. This celebrated order gave, upon many occasions, eminent proofs of their resolution and valour, and acquired immense opulence by their heroic achievements. When *Palestine* was irrecoverably lost, the *knights* passed into the isle of *Cyprus*; they afterwards made themselves masters of the isle of *Rhodes*, where they maintained themselves for a long time; but being, at length, driven thence by the Turks, they received from the emperor **CHARLES V** a grant of the island of *Malta*, where their chief, or grand commander, still resides [z].

The knights
templars.

XIV. Another order, which was entirely of a military nature, was that of the *knights templars*, so called from a palace, adjoining to the temple of *Jerusalem*, which was appropriated to their use for a certain time by **BALDUIN II**. The foundations of this order were laid at *Jerusalem*, in the year 1118, by **HUGUES DES PAYENS**, **GEOFFRY** of **St. ALDEMAR**, or **St. OMER**, as some will have it, and seven other persons whose names are unknown; but it was not before the year 1128, that it acquired a proper degree of stability, by being confirmed solemnly in the council of *Troyes*, and subjected to a rule of discipline drawn up by **St. BERNARD** [a]. These warlike templars were to defend and support the cause of Christianity by force of arms, to have inspection over the public roads, and to protect the pilgrims, who came to visit *Jerusalem* against the insults and barbarity of the Mahometans. The order flourished for some time, and acquired, by the valour of its knights, immense riches and an eminent degree of military re-

[z] The best and the most recent history of this order is that which was composed by **VERTOT** at the request of the knights of *Malta*; it was first published at *Paris*, and afterwards at *Amsterdam*, in five volumes, 8vo. in the year 1732. See also **HELYOT's Hist. des Ordres**, tom. iii. p. 72.

[a] See **MABILLON, Annal. Benedict.** tom. vi. p. 159.

nown;

known; but as their prosperity increased, their vices were multiplied, and their arrogance, luxury, and inhuman cruelty rose at last to such a monstrous height, that their privileges were revoked and their order suppressed with the most terrible circumstances of infamy and severity by a decree of the pope and of the council of *Vienne* in *Dauphiny*, as we shall see in the history of the *xivth* century [b].

CENT.
XII.

XV. The third order resembled the first in this respect, that though it was a military institution, the care of the poor, and the relief of the sick were not excluded from the services it prescribed. Its members were distinguished by the title of *Teutonic knights of St. Mary of Jerusalem*, and as to its first rise, we cannot, with any degree of certainty, trace it farther back than the year 1190, during the siege of *Accâ*, or *Ptolemais*, though there are Historians adventurous enough to seek its origin (which they place at *Jerusalem*) in a more remote period. During the long and tedious siege of *Accâ*, several pious and charitable merchants of *Bremen* and *Lubeck*, touched with compassion at a sight of the miseries that the besiegers suffered in the midst of their success, devoted themselves entirely to the service of the sick and wounded soldiers, and erected a kind of hospital or tent, where they gave constant attendance to all such unhappy objects as had recourse to their charity. This pious undertaking was so agreeable to the German princes, who were present at this terrible siege, that they thought proper to form a fraternity of German knights to bring it to a greater degree of perfection. Their resolution was highly approved of by the Roman pontiff CELESTINE III, who confirmed the new order by a bull issued out the twenty third of February, A. D. 1192. This order was entirely appropriated to the Germans, and even of them none were admitted as members of it, but such as were of an illustrious birth. The sup-

The Teutonic order.

[b] See MATTHEW PARIS, *Histor. Major*, p. 56. for an account of the commencement of this order. See also PUTEAN, *Histoire de l'Ordre Militaire des Templiers*, which was republished, with considerable additions, at *Brussels* in 4to, in the year 1751.—NIC. GURTLERI *Historia Templariorum Militum*, *Amstelodam*. 1691, in 8vo.

CENT.
XII.

port of Christianity, the defence of the Holy land, and the relief of the poor and needy, were the important duties and service to which the Teutonic knights devoted themselves by a solemn vow. Austerity and frugality were the first characteristics of this rising order, and the equestrian garment [c], with bread and water, were the only rewards which the knights derived from their generous labours. But as, according to the fate of human things, prosperity engenders corruption, so it happened that this austerity was of a short duration, and diminished in proportion as the revenues and possessions of the order augmented. The Teutonic knights, after their retreat from *Palestine*, made themselves masters of *Prussia*, *Livonia*, *Courland*, and *Semigallen*; but, in process of time, their victorious arms received several checks, and when the light of the reformation arose upon *Germany*, they were deprived of the richest provinces which they possessed in that country, though they still retain there a certain portion of their ancient territories [d].

C H A P. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The state of
the church in
the western
and northern
provinces.

I. **T**HE progress of Christianity in the west had disarmed its most inveterate enemies, and deprived them of the power of doing much mischief, though they still entertained the same aversion to the disciples of *JESUS*. The Jews and Pagans were no longer able to oppose the propagation of the gospel, or to oppress its ministers. Their malignity remained, but their credit

[c] This garment was a white mantle with a black cross.

[d] See RAYMUNDI DUELLII *Histor. Ordin. Teutonici*, published in folio at *Vienna* in 1727.—PETRI DUSBURG, *Chronicon Prussiae*, published in 4to at *Jena*, in the year 1679, by CHRISTOPH. HARTKNOCHIUS.—HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. iii. p. 140.—*Chronicon Ordinis Teutonici* in ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analectis veteris ævi*, tom. v. p. 621. 658. ed. nov.—*Privilegia Ordinis Teutonici* in PETR. à LUDEWIG *Reliquiis Manuscriptor.* tom. vi. p. 43.

and

and authority were gone. The Jews were accused by the Christians of various crimes, whether real or fictitious we shall not determine; but instead of attacking their accusers, they were satisfied to defend their own lives, and to secure their persons, without daring to give vent to their resentment. The state of things was somewhat different in the Northern provinces. The Pagans were yet numerous there in several districts, and wherever they were the majority, they persecuted the Christians with the utmost barbarity, the most unrelenting, and merciless fury [e]. It is true, the Christian kings and princes, who lived in the neighbourhood of these persecuting Barbarians, checked by degrees their impetuous rage, and never ceased to harass and weaken them by perpetual wars and incursions, until, at length, they subdued them entirely, and deprived them, by force, both of their independency and their superstitions.

II. The writers of this century complain grievously of the inhuman rage with which the Saracens persecuted the Christians in the east, nor can we question the truth of what they relate concerning this terrible persecution. But they pass over in silence the principal reasons that inflamed the resentment of this fierce people, and voluntarily forget that the Christians were the first aggressors in this dreadful war. If we consider the matter with impartiality and candour, the conduct of the Saracens, however barbarous it may have been, will not appear so surprizing, particularly when we reflect on the provocations they received. In the first place, they had a right, by the laws of war, to repel, by force, the violent invasion of their country, and the Christians could not expect without being chargeable with the most frontless impudence, that a people whom they attacked with a formidable army, and whom, in the fury of their misguided zeal, they massacred without mercy, should receive their insults with a tame submission, and give

Its sufferings
in the east.

[e] HELMOLD, *Chronic. Slavor.* lib. i. cap. xxxiv. p. 88. cap. xxxv. p. 89, cap. xl. p. 99.—LINDENBROGII *Scriptor. Septentrional.* p. 195, 196. 201.—PETRI LAMBECHII *Res Hamburg.* lib. i. p. 23.

CENT.
XII.

up their lives and possessions without resistance. It must also be confessed, though with sorrow, that the Christians did not content themselves with making war upon the Mahometans in order to deliver *Jerusalem* and the holy sepulchre out of their hands, but carried their brutal fury to the greatest length, disgraced their cause by the most detestable crimes, filled the eastern provinces through which they passed, with scenes of horror, and made the Saracens feel the terrible effects of their violence and barbarity wherever their arms were successful. Is it then so surprizing to see the infidel Saracens committing, by way of reprisal, the same barbarities that the holy warriors had perpetrated without the least provocation? Is there any thing so new and so extraordinary in this, that a people naturally fierce, and exasperated, moreover, by the calamities of a religious war carried on against them in contradiction to all the dictates of justice and humanity, should avenge themselves upon the Christians who resided in *Palestine*, as professing the religion which gave occasion to the war, and attached, of consequence, to the cause of their enemies and invaders?

Prestor John
departs this
life.

III. The rapid and amazing victories of the great GENGHIZKAN, emperor of the Tartars, gave an unhappy turn to the affairs of the Christians in the northern parts of *Asia*, towards the conclusion of this century. This heroic prince, who was by birth a Mogol, and whose military exploits raise him in the list of fame above almost all the commanders either of ancient or modern times, rendered his name formidable throughout all *Asia*, whose most flourishing dynasties fell successively before his victorious arms. DAVID, or UNGCHAN, who, according to some, was the son, or, as others will have it, the brother, but who was certainly the successor of the famous PRESTER JOHN, and was himself so called in common discourse, was the first victim that GENGHIZKAN sacrificed to his boundless ambition. He invaded his territory, and put to flight his troops in a bloody battle, where DAVID lost, at the same

same time, his kingdom and his life [*f*]. The princes, who governed the Turks, Indians, and the province of *Cathay*, fell, in their turn, before the victorious Tartar, and were all either put to death, or rendered tributary; nor did GENGHIZKAN stop here, but proceeding into *Persia*, *India*, and *Arabia*, he overturned the Saracen dominion in those regions, and substituted that of the Tartars in its place [*g*]. From this period the Christian cause lost much of its authority and credit in the provinces that had been ruled by PRESTER JOHN and his successor DAVID, and continued to decline and lose ground from day to day, until, at length, it sunk entirely under the weight of oppression, and was succeeded in some places by the errors of MAHOMET, and in others by the superstitions of paganism. We must except, however, in this general account the kingdom of *Tangut*, the chief residence of PRESTER JOHN, in which his posterity, who persevered in the profession of Christianity, maintained, for a long time, a certain sort of tributary dominion, which exhibited, indeed, but a faint shadow of their former grandeur [*h*].

[*f*] The Greek, Latin, and Oriental writers are far from being agreed concerning the year in which the emperor of the tartars attacked and defeated PRESTER JOHN. The most of the Latin writers place this event in the year 1202, and consequently in the xiii century. But MARCUS PAULUS VENETUS (in his book *De Regionibus Orientalibus*, lib. i. cap. li, lii, liii.) and other historians, whose accounts I have followed as the most probable, place the defeat of this second PRESTER JOHN in the year 1187. The learned and illustrious DEMETRIUS CANTEMIR (in his *Præf. ad Histor. imperii Ottomanici*, p. 45. tom. i. of the French edition) gives an account of this matter different from the two now mentioned, and affirms, upon the authority of the Arabian writers, that GENGHIZKAN did not invade the territories of his neighbours before the year 1214.

[*g*] See PETIT DE LA CROIX, *Histoire de Genghizkan*, p. 120. 121. published in 12^m at Paris in the year 1711. — HÉRBELOT, *Biblioth. Oriental*, at the article GENGHIZKAN, p. 378. — ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. I. p. 101, & 295. — JEAN DU PLAN CARPIN, *Voyage en Tartarie*. ch. v. in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, tom. vii. p. 350.

[*h*] ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 500.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

The state of
learning a-
mong the
Greeks.

I. **N**OTWITHSTANDING the decline of the Grecian empire, the calamities in which it was frequently involved, and the perpetual revolutions and civil wars that consumed its strength and were precipitating its ruin, the arts and sciences still flourished, in *Greece*, and covered with glory such as cultivated them with assiduity and success. This was owing, not only to the liberality of the emperors, and to the extraordinary zeal which the family of the COMNENI discovered for the advancement of learning, but also to the provident vigilance of the patriarchs of *Constantinople*, who took all possible measures to prevent the clergy from falling into ignorance and sloth, lest the Greek church should thus be deprived of able champions to defend its cause against the Latins. The learned and ingenious commentaries of EUSTATHIUS, bishop of *Thessalonica*, upon *Homer*, and DIONYSIUS the *Geographer*, are sufficient to shew the diligence and labour that were employed by men of the first genius in the improvement of classical erudition and in the study of antiquity. And if we turn our view towards the various writers who composed in this century the history of their own times, such as CINNAMUS, GLYCAS, ZONARAS, NICEPHORUS, BRYENNIUS, and others, we shall find in their productions undoubted marks of learning and genius, as well as of a laudable ambition to obtain the esteem and approbation of future ages.

II. Nothing

II. Nothing could equal the zeal and enthusiasm with which MICHAEL ANCHIALUS, patriarch of *Constantinople*, encouraged the study of philosophy by his munificence, and still more by the extraordinary influence of his illustrious example [a]. It seems, however, to have been the Aristotelian philosophy, that was favoured in such a distinguished manner by this eminent prelate; and it was in the illustration and improvement of this profound and intricate system that such of the Greeks, as had a philosophical turn, were principally employed, as appears evident from several remains of ancient erudition, and particularly from the commentaries of EUSTATHIUS upon the ethics and other treatises of the Grecian sage. We are not, however, to imagine that the sublime wisdom of PLATO was neglected in this century, or that his doctrines were fallen into disrepute. It appears, on the contrary, that they were adopted by many. Such more especially, as had imbibed the precepts and spirit of the Mystics, preferred them infinitely before the Peripatetic philosophy, which they considered as an endless source of sophistry and presumption, while they looked upon the Platonic system as the philosophy of reason and piety, of candour and virtue. This diversity of sentiments produced the famous controversy which was managed with such vehemence and erudition among the Greeks, concerning the respective merit and excellence of the Peripatetic and Platonic doctrines.

III. In the western world the pursuit of knowledge was now carried on with incredible emulation and ardour, and all the various branches of science were studied with the greatest application and industry. This literary enthusiasm was encouraged and supported by the influence and liberality of certain of the European monarchs, and Roman pontiffs, who perceived the happy tendency of the sciences to soften the savage manners of uncivilized nations, and thereby to administer an additional support to civil government, as well as an orna-

CENT.
XII.
— f
The state of
philosophy

The state of
learning among the
Latins.

[a] THEODORUS BALSAMON, *Præf. ad Photii Nomocanonem* in HENR. JUSTELLI *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris*, tom. ii. p. 814.

CENT.
XII.

ment to human society. Hence learned societies were formed, and colleges established in several places, in which the liberal arts and sciences were publicly taught. The prodigious concourse of students, who resorted thither for instruction, occasioned, in process of time, the enlargement of these schools, which had arisen from small beginnings, and their erection into *universities*, as they were called in the succeeding age. The principal cities of *Europe* were adorned with establishments of this kind; but *Paris* surpassed them all in the number and variety of its schools, the merit and reputation of its public teachers, and the immense multitude of the studious youth that frequented their colleges. And thus was exhibited in that famous city the model of our present schools of learning; a model indeed defective in several respects, but which, in after times, was corrected and improved, and brought gradually to higher degrees of perfection [b]. About the same time the famous school of *Angers*, in which the youth were instructed in various sciences, and particularly and principally in the civil law, was founded by the zeal and industry of *ULGERIUS*, bishop of that city [c], and the college of *Montpellier*, where law and physic were taught with great success, had already acquired a considerable reputation [d]. The same literary spirit reigned also in *Italy*. The academy of *Bolonia*, whose origin may certainly be traced higher than this century, was now in the highest renown, and was frequented by great numbers of students, and of such more especially as were desirous of being instructed in the civil and canon laws. The fame of this academy was, in a great measure, owing to the munificence of the emperor *LOTHARIUS II*,

[b] DE BOULAY *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 463.—PASQUIER, *Recherches de la France*, livr. iii. ch. xxix.—PETRI LAMBECCI *Histor. Biblioth. Vindobon.* lib. ii. cap. v. p. 260.—*Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 60.—80.

[c] BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 215.—POCQUET DE LA LIVONIERE, *Dissert. sur l'Antiquité de l'Université d'Angers*, p. 21. published in 4to at *Angers*, 1736.

[d] *Histoire Gener. de Languedoc, par les Bénédictins*, tom. ii. p. 517.

who

who took it under his protection, and enriched it with new privileges and immunities [e]. In the same province flourished also the celebrated school of *Salernum*, where great numbers resorted, and which was wholly set apart for the study of physic. While this zealous emulation, in advancing the cause of learning and philosophy, animated so many princes, and prelates, and discovered itself in the erection of so many academies and schools of learning, the Roman pontiff ALEXANDER III, was seized also with this noble enthusiasm. In a council held at *Rome* A. D. 1179, he caused a solemn law to be published, for the erecting new schools in the monasteries and cathedrals, and restoring those which, through the sloth and ignorance of the monks and bishops, had fallen into ruin, to their primitive credit and lustre [f]. But the effect which his law was intended to produce was prevented by the growing fame of the new erected academies, to which the youth resorted from all parts, and left the *episcopal* and *monastic* schools entirely empty, so that they gradually declined and sunk, at last, into a total oblivion.

IV. Many were the signal advantages that attended these literary establishments; and, what is particularly worthy of notice, they not only rendered knowledge more universal by facilitating the means of instruction, but

A new division of the sciences.

[e] The inhabitants of *Bolonia* pretend, that their academy was founded in the vth century by THEODOSIUS II, and they shew the *diploma* by which that emperor enriched their city with this valuable establishment. But the greatest part of those writers, who have studied with attention and impartiality the records of ancient times, maintain, that this diploma is a spurious production, and alledge many weighty arguments to prove that the academy of *Bolonia* is of no older date than the xth century, and that in the succeeding age, particularly from the time of LOTHARIUS II, it received those improvements that rendered it so famous throughout all *Europe*. See CAR. SIGONII *Historia Bononiensis*, as it is published, with learned observations, in the works of that excellent author. MURATORI *Antiqq. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 23. 884. 898.—JUST. HENN. BOHMERI *Præfat. ad Corpus juris Canon.* p. 9. as also the elegant *History of the Academy of Bolonia*, written in the German language by the learned KEUFELIUS, and published at *Helmstadt* in 8vo. in the year 1750.

[f] See B. BOHMERI *Jus. Eccles. Protestant.* tom. iv. p. 705.

were

CENT.
XII.

were also the occasion of forming a new circle of sciences, better digested, and much more comprehensive than that which had been hitherto studied by the greatest adepts in learning. The whole extent of learning and philosophy, before this period, was confined to the *seven liberal arts*, as they were commonly called, of which three were known by the name of the *trivium*, which comprehended *grammar*, *rhetoric*, and *logic*; and the other four by the title of *quadrivium*, which included *arithmetic*, *music*, *geometry*, and *astronomy*. The greatest part of the learned, as we have formerly observed, were satisfied with their literary acquisitions, when they had made themselves masters of the *trivium*, while such as, with an adventurous flight, aspired after the *quadrivium* were considered as stars of the first magnitude, as the great luminaries of the learned world. But in this century the aspect of letters underwent a considerable and an advantageous change. The number of the *liberal arts* and sciences was augmented, and new and unfrequented paths of knowledge were opened to the emulation of the studious youth. *Theology* was placed in the number of the sciences, not that ancient theology which had no merit but its simplicity, and which was drawn, without the least order or connexion, from divers passages of the holy scriptures, and from the opinions and inventions of the primitive doctors, but that *philosophical* or *scholastic theology*, that with the deepest abstraction traced divine truth to its first principles, and followed it from thence into its various connexions and branches. Nor was theology alone added to the ancient circle of sciences, the study of the learned languages, of the civil and canon law, and of physick [g], were now brought into high repute. Particular academies were consecrated to the culture of each of these sciences in various places, and thus it was natural to consider them as im-

[g] The word *physica*, though, according to its etymology, it denotes the study of natural philosophy in general, was, in the *xiii*th century, applied particularly to medicinal studies, and it has also preserved that limited sense in the English language.]

portant branches of erudition, and an acquaintance with them as a qualification necessary to such as aimed at universal learning. All this required a considerable change in the division of the sciences hitherto received; and this change was accordingly brought about. The seven *liberal arts* were, by degrees, reduced to one general title, and were comprehended under the name of philosophy, to which *theology*, *jurisprudence*, and *physic* were added. And hence the origin of the four classes of science, or, to use the academical phrase of the four faculties, which took place in the *universities* in the following century.

V. A happy and unexpected event restored in *Italy* the lustre and authority of the ancient Roman law, and, at the same time, lessened the credit of all the other systems of legislation that had been received for several ages past. This event was the discovery of the original manuscript of the famous *Pandect* of JUSTINIAN, which was found in the ruins of *Amalphi*, or *Melfi*, when that city was taken by LOTHARIUS II, in the year 1137, and of which that emperor made a present to the inhabitants of *Pisa*, whose fleet had contributed, in a particular manner, to the success of the siege. This admirable collection which had been almost buried in oblivion, was no sooner recovered than the Roman law became the grand object of the studies and labours of the learned. In the academy of *Bolonia*, there were particular colleges erected expressly for the study of the Roman jurisprudence; and these excellent institutions were multiplied in several parts of *Italy* in process of time, and animated other European nations to imitate so wise an example. Hence arose a great revolution in the public tribunals, and an entire change in their judicial proceedings. Hitherto different systems of law were followed in different courts, and every person of distinction, particularly among the Franks, had the liberty of choosing the body of laws, that was to be the rule of his conduct. But the Roman law acquired such credit and authority, that it superseded, by degrees, all other laws in the greatest part of *Europe*, and was substituted in the

CENT.
XII.The study of
Roman law
revived.

CENT.
XII.

the place of the Salic, Lombard, and Burgundian codes, which before this period were in the highest reputation. It is an ancient opinion, that LOTHARIUS II, pursuant to the counsels and solicitations of IRNERIUS [b], principal professor of the Roman law in the academy of *Bolonia*, published an edict enjoining the abrogation of all the statutes then in force, and substituting in their place the Roman law, by which, for the future, all without exception were to modify their contracts, terminate their differences, and to regulate their actions. But this opinion, as many learned men have abundantly proved [i], is far from being supported by sufficient evidence.

Ecclesiastical
or canon
law.

VI. No sooner was the civil law placed in the number of the sciences, and considered as an important branch of academical learning, than the Roman pontiffs, and their zealous adherents, judged it not only expedient, but also highly necessary, that the *canon* law, should have the same privilege. There were not wanting before this time certain collections of the *canons* or laws of the church; but these collections were so destitute of order and method, and were so defective both with respect to matter and form, that they could not be conveniently explained in the schools, or to be made use of as systems of ecclesiastical polity. Hence it was, that GRATIAN, a Benedictine monk, belonging to the convent of St. FELIX and NABOR at *Bolonia*, and by birth a Tuscan, composed about the year 1130, for the use of schools, an abridgment, or *Epitome of canon law*,

[b] Otherwise called WERNER.

[i] See HERM. CONRINGIUS, *De origine juris Germanici*. cap. xxii. — GUIDO GRANDUS, *Epist. de Pandectis*, p. 21. 69. published at Florence in 4to. in 1737. — HENRY BRENCMANN, *Historia Pandectarum* p. 41. — LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Præf. ad Leges Langobardicas, scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. i. part. II. p. 4. & *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*. tom. ii. p. 285. There was a warm controversy carried on concerning this matter between GEORGE CALLIXTUS and BARTHOL. NIHUSIUS, the latter of whom embraced the vulgar opinion concerning the edict of LOTHARIUS, obtained by the solicitations of IRNERIUS; of this controversy there is a circumstantial account in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MÖLLERUS, tom. iii. p. 142.

drawn

drawn from the letters of the pontiffs, the decrees of C E N T.
councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors. Pope XII.
EUGENIUS III was extremely satisfied with this work,
which was also received with the highest applause by the
doctors and professors of *Bolonia*, and was unanimously
adopted, as the text they were to follow in their public
lectures. The professors at *Paris* were the first that fol-
lowed the example of those of *Bolonia*, which, in pro-
cess of time was imitated by the greatest part of the Eu-
ropean colleges. But, notwithstanding the encomiums
bestowed upon this performance, which was commonly
called the *decretal* of GRATIAN [k], and was intitled by
the author himself, the *reunion or coalition of the jarring*
canons [l], several most learned and eminent writers of
the Romish communion acknowledge, that it is full of
errors and defects of various kinds [m]. As, however,
the main design of this abridgment of the canons was to
support the despotism, and to extend the authority of
the Roman pontiffs; its innumerable defects were over-
looked; its merits were exaggerated; and, what is still
more surprizing, it enjoys at this day, in an age of light
and liberty, that high degree of veneration and authori-
ty, which was inconsiderately, though more excusably,
lavished upon it in an age of spiritual tyranny, supersti-
tion and darkness [n].

VII. Such

[k] *Decretum GRATIANI.*[l] *Concordia Discordantium Canonum.*[m] See, among others, ANTON. AUGUSTINUS, *De Emendatione GRATIANI*, published in 8vo at *Arnhem*, A. D. 1678, with the learned observations of STEPH. BALUZIUS and GER. a MASTRICHT.[n] See GERHARD a MASTRICHT, *Historia juris Ecclesiastici*, § 293. p. 325.—B. JUST. HENN. BÖHMLER *Jus. Eccles. Protestant.* tom. i. p. 100. and more particularly the learned *Preface*, with which this last mentioned author enriched the new edition of the *Canon Law*, published at *Hal*, in 4to. in the year 1747. See also ALEX. MACHIAVELLI *Observationes ad Sigonii Histor. Bononiensem*, tom. iii. *Oper. Sigonii*, p. 128. This writer has drawn from the *Kalendarium Archigymnasii Bononiensis*, several particularities concerning GRATIAN and his work, which were generally unknown, but whose truth is also much disputed. What increases the suspicion of their being fabulous is, that this famous *Kalendar*, of which the *Bolonians* boast so much, and which they have so

CENT.
XII.

The state of
philosophy among the
Latins.

VII. Such among the Latins, as were ambitious of making a figure in the republic of letters, applied themselves, with the utmost zeal and diligence, to the study of philosophy. Philosophy, taken in its most extensive and general meaning, comprehended, according to the method which was the most universally received towards the middle of this century, four classes; it was divided into *theoretical, practical, mechanical, and logical*. The first class comprehended *natural theology, mathematics, and natural philosophy*. In the second class were ranked *ethics, æconomics, and politics*. The third contained the seven arts that are more immediately subservient to the purposes of life, such as *navigation, agriculture, hunting, &c.* The fourth was divided into *grammar and composition*, the latter of which was farther subdivided into *rhetoric, dialectic, and sophistry*; and under the term *dialectic* was comprehended that part of *metaphysic*; which treats of *general notions*. This division was almost universally adopted. Some, indeed, were for separating *grammar and mechanics* from *philosophy*; a separation highly condemned by others, who, under the general term *philosophy*, comprehended the whole circle of the sciences [o].

Dissensions
among the
philosophers.

VIII. The learned, who treated these different branches of science, were divided into various factions, which attacked each other with the utmost animosity and bitterness [p]. There were, at this time, *three* methods of teaching philosophy that were practised by different doctors. The *first* was the *ancient and plain* method, which confined its researches to the philosophical

so often promised to publish in order to dispel the doubts of the learned, has never as yet seen the light. Besides, in the fragments that have appeared, there are manifest marks of unfair dealing.

[o] These literary anecdotes I have taken from several writers, particularly from HUGO a St. VICTOR, *Didascali Libro ii. cap. ii. p. 7.* tom. i. Opp. and from the *Metalogicum* of JOHN of Salisbury.

[p] See GODOF. de St. VICTOR. *Carmen de Sectis Philosoph.* published by LE BOEUF, in his *Diss. sur l'Histoire Ecclesiast. et Civile de Paris.* tom. ii. p. 254.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 562.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiq. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 51.—JO. SARISBURIENSIS *Metalog. et Policrat.* passim.

notions

notions of PORPHYRY, and the *dialectic* system, commonly attributed to St. AUGUSTINE, and in which was laid down this general rule, that philosophical inquiries were to be limited to a small number of subjects, lest, by their becoming too extensive, religion might suffer by a profane mixture of human subtilty with its divine wisdom. The *second* method was called the *Aristotelian*, because it consisted in explications of the works of that philosopher [q], several of whose books, being translated into Latin, were now almost every where in the hands of the learned. These translations were, indeed, extremely obscure and incorrect, and led those, who made use of them in their academical lectures, into various blunders, and often into notions, which were not more absurd, than whimsical and singular. The *third* was termed the *free method*, employed by such as were bold enough to search after truth, in the manner they thought the most adapted to render their inquiries successful, and who followed the bent of their own genius, without rejecting, however, the succours of ARISTOTLE and PLATO. Laudable as this method was, it became an abundant source of sophistry and chicane by the imprudent management of those that employed it; for these subtle doctors, through a wanton indulgence of their metaphysical fancies, did little more than puzzle their disciples with vain questions, and fatigue them with endless distinctions, and divisions [r]. These different systems, and vehement contests that divided the philosophers, gave many persons a disgust against philosophy

[q] ROB. DE MONTE, *Append. ad Sigebertum Gemblacens.* published by LUC DACHERIUS, among the works of GUIBERT, abbot of Nogent, ad A. 1128, p. 753. *Jacobus Clericus de Venecia transtulit de Græco in Latinum quosdam libros Aristotelis et commentatus est, scilicet Topica, Anal. priores et posteriores et elenchos. Quamvis antiquior translatio super eosdem libros haberetur.* THOM. BECKET. *Epistolar.* lib. ii ep. xciii. p. 454. edit. Bruxell. 1682, in 4to. *Itero preces, quatenus libros Aristotelis, quos habetis, mibi faciatis exscribi. . . Precor etiam iterata supplicatione, quatenus in operibus Aristotelis, ubi difficiliora fuerint, notulas faciatis, eo quod interpretem aliquatenus suspectum habeo, quia licet eloquens fuerit alias, ut sæpe audiui, minus tamen fuit in grammatica institutus.*

[r] See JO. SARISBERIENSIS *Policrat.* p. 434. et *Metalog.* p. 814, &c

C E N T.
XII.

The contents
of the Dialecti-
cians, Rea-
lists, and No-
minalists de-
scribed.

in general, and made them desire, with impatience, its banishment from the public schools.

IX. Of all the controversies that divided the philosophers in this century, there were none carried on with greater animosity, and treated with greater subtilty and refinement, than the contest of the *Dialectics* concerning *universals*. These sophistical doctors were wholly occupied about the intricate questions relating to *genus* and *species*, to the solution of which they directed all their philosophical efforts, and the whole course of their metaphysical studies; but not all in the same method, nor upon the same principles [s]. The two leading sects into which they had been divided long before this period, and which were distinguished by the titles of *Realists* and *Nominalists*, not only subsisted still, but were moreover subdivided, each into smaller parties and factions, according as the two opposite and leading schemes were modified by new fancies and inventions. The *Nominalists*, though they had their followers, were nevertheless much inferior to the *Realists* both with respect to the number of their disciples, and to the credit and reputation of their doctrine. A third sect arose under the name of *Formalists*, who pretended to terminate the controversy, by steering a middle course between the two jarring systems now mentioned; but as the hypo-

[s] JOHN of Salisbury, a very elegant and ingenious writer of this age, censures, with a good deal of wit, the crude and unintelligible speculations of these sophists, in his book entitled, *Polycraticon, seu de Nugis Curialium* lib. vii. p. 451. He observes, that there had been more time consumed in solving the question relating to *genus* and *species*, than the *Cæsars* had employed in making themselves masters of the whole world; that the riches of CROESUS were inferior to the treasures that had been exhausted in this controversy; and that the contending parties, after having spent their whole lives upon this single point, had neither been so happy as to determine it to their satisfaction, nor to make, in the labyrinth of science where they had been groping, any discovery that was worth the pains they had taken. His words are: *Veterem paratus est solvere quæstionem de generibus et speciebus* (he speaks here of a certain philosopher) *in qua laborans mundus jam senuit. in qua plus temporis consumtum est, quam in acquirendo et regendo orbis imperio consumpserit Cæsarea domus: plus effusum pecuniæ, quam in omnibus divitiis suis possederit Cræsus. Hæc enim tamdiu multos tenuit, ut cum hoc unum tota vita quærent, tandem nec istud, nec aliud invenirent.*

thesis

thesis of these new doctors was most obscure and unintelligible, they only perplexed matters more than they had hitherto been, and did nothing more than furnish new subjects of contention and dispute [t].

Those among the learned, who turned their pursuits to more interesting and beneficial branches of science, than the intricate and puzzling doctrine of *universals*, travelled into the different countries, where the kinds of knowledge they were bent upon cultivating, flourished most. The students of physic, astronomy, and mathematics, continued to frequent the schools of the Saracens in *Spain*. Many of the learned productions of the Arabians were also translated into Latin [u]; for the high

[t] See the above cited author's *Policrat.* lib. vii. p. 451. where he gives a succinct account of the *Formalists*, *Realists*, and *Nominalists* in the following words: *Sunt qui more mathematicorum FORMAS abstrahunt, et ad illas quicquid de universalibus dicitur referunt.* Such were the *Formalists* who applied the doctrine of universal ideas to what the mathematicians call *abstract forms*. *Alii discutiunt INTELLECTUS et eos universalium nominibus censeri confirmant.* Here we find the *Realists* pointed out, who, under the name of *universals*, comprehended all intellectual powers, qualities, and ideas. *Fuerunt et qui VOCES ipsas generaverunt et species: sed eorum jam explosa sententia est et facile cum autore suo evanuit.* *Sunt tamen adhuc, qui deprehenduntur in vestigiis eorum, licet erubescant vel auctorem vel scientiam profiteri, SOLIS NOMINIBUS inherentes, quod rebus et intellectibus subtrahunt, SERMONIBUS ascribunt.* This was a sect of the *Nominalists*, who, ashamed (as this author alleges) to profess the exploded doctrine of *ROSCELLINUS*, which placed *genus* and *species* in the class of mere words, or simple denominations, modified that system by a slight change of expression only, which did not essentially distinguish their doctrine from that of the ordinary *Nominalists*. It appears from all this, that the sect of the *Formalists* is of more ancient date than *JOHN DUNS SCOTUS*, whom many learned men consider as its founder. See *JO. SARISBER.* *Metalogec.* lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 814. where that eminent author describes at large the various contests of these three sects, and sums up their differences in the following words; *Alius consistit in vocibus, licet hæc opinio cum Roscellino suo fere jam evanuerit: alius sermones intuetur: alius versatur in intellectibus, &c.*

[u] *GERHARD* of *Cremona*, who was so famous among the Italians for his eminent skill in astronomy and physic, undertook a voyage to *Toledo*, where he translated into Latin several Arabian treatises; see *MURATORI Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. p. 936, 937.—*MIRMET*, a French monk, travelled into *Spain* and *Africa* to learn geography and

CENT.
XII.

high esteem in which the erudition of that people was held, together with a desire of converting the Spanish Saracens to Christianity, had excited many to study their language, and to acquire a considerable knowledge of their doctrine.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The lives
and manners
of the clergy.

I. **W**HEREVER we turn our eyes among the various ranks and orders of the clergy, we perceive, in this century, the most flagrant marks of licentiousness and fraud, ignorance and luxury, and other vices whose pernicious effects were deeply felt both in church and state. If we except a very small number, who retained a sense of the sanctity of their vocation, and lamented the corruption and degeneracy of their order, it may be said, with respect to the rest, that their whole business was to satisfy their lusts, to multiply their privileges by grasping perpetually at new honours and distinctions, to increase their opulence, to diminish the authority, and encroach upon the privileges of princes and magistrates, and, neglecting entirely the interests of religion and the cure of souls, to live in ease and pleasure, and draw out their days in an unmanly and

among the Saracens. See LUC. DACHERII *Spicilegium vet. scriptor.* tom. ix. p. 443. ed. *Antiq.*—DANIEL MORLACH, an Englishman, who was extremely fond of mathematical learning, went a journey to *Toledo*, from whence he brought into his own country a considerable number of Arabian books; ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 55.—PETER, abbot of *Clugni*, surnamed the *Venerable*, after having sojourned for some time among the Spaniards in order to make himself master of the Arabian language, translated into Latin the *Alcoran*, and the *Life of Mahomet*; see MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. lib. lxxvii. p. 345. This eminent ecclesiastic, as appears from the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, p. 1169. found, upon his arrival in *Spain*, persons of learning from *England* and other nations, who applied themselves with extraordinary assiduity and ardor to the study of astrology. We might multiply the examples of those who travelled in quest of science during this century; but those now alledged are sufficient for our purpose.

Luxurious

luxurious indolence. This appears manifestly from two remarkable treatises of St. BERNARD, in one of which he exposes the corruption of the pontiffs and bishops [*w*], while he describes in the other the enormous crimes of the monastic orders, whose licentiousness he chastises with a just severity [*x*].

CENT.
XII.

II. The Roman pontiffs, who were placed successively at the head of the church, governed that spiritual and mystical body by the maxims of carnal and worldly ambition, and thereby fomented the warm contest that had already arisen between the imperial and sacerdotal powers. On the one hand, the popes not only maintained the opulence and authority they had already acquired, but extended their views farther, and laboured strenuously to enlarge both, though they had not all equal success in this ambitious attempt. The European emperors and princes, on the other hand, alarmed at the strides which the pontiffs were making to universal dominion, used their utmost efforts to disconcert their measures, and to check their growing opulence and power. These violent dissensions between the *empire* and the *priesthood* (for so the contending parties were styled in this century) were most unhappy in their effects, which were felt throughout all the European provinces. PASCAL II, who had been raised to the pontificate about the conclusion of the preceding age, seemed now to sit firm and secure in the apostolic chair, without the least apprehension from the imperial faction, whose affairs had taken an unfavourable turn, and who had not the courage to elect a new pope of their party in the place of GUIBERT, who died in the year 1100 [*y*].

The pontiffs
ambitious to
extend their
authority.

PASCAL

[*w*] In the work entitled, *Considerationum Libri v. ad Eugenium Pontificem*.

[*x*] See his defence of the crusades under the title of *Apologia ad Guilielmum Abbatem*; as also GERHARDUS *De corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu* in BALUZII *Miscell.* tom. v. p. 63.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 6. *App.* tom. ii. p. 265. 273, &c. BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 490. 690.

[*y*] Dr. MOSHEIM's affirmation here must be somewhat modified

CENT.
XII.

The dispute
concerning
investitures
is fomented
anew.

PASCAL therefore, unwilling to let pass unimproved the present success of the papal faction, renewed, in a council assembled at *Rome* A. D. 1102, the decrees of his predecessors against *investitures*, and the excommunications they had thundered out against HENRY IV, and used his most vigorous endeavours to raise up on all sides new enemies to that unfortunate emperor. HENRY, however, opposed, with great constancy and resolution, the efforts of this violent pontiff, and eluded with much dexterity and vigilance his perfidious stratagems. But his heart, wounded in the tenderest part, lost all its firmness and courage, when, in the year 1106, an unnatural son, under the impious pretext of religion, took up arms against his person and his cause. HENRY V, so was this monster afterwards named, seized his father in a most treacherous manner, and obliged him to abdicate the empire; after which the unhappy prince retired to *Liege*, where, deserted by all his adherents, he departed this life, and so got rid of his misery in the year 1106. It has been a matter of dispute, whether it was the instigation of the pontiff, or the ambitious and impatient thirst after dominion, that engaged HENRY V, to declare war against his father; nor is it, perhaps, easy to decide this question with a perfect degree of evidence. One thing, however, is unquestionably certain, and that is, that PASCAL II dissolved, or rather impiously pretended to dissolve, the oath of fidelity and obedience that HENRY had taken to his father; and not only so, but adopted the cause and supported the interests of this unnatural rebel with the utmost zeal, assiduity, and fervor [z].

in order to be true; it is certain, that after the death of GUIBERT, the imperial party chose in his place a person named ALBERT, who indeed, was seized the day of his election, and cast into prison. THEODORIC and MAGNULF, were successively chosen after ALBERT, but could not support for any time their claim to the pontificate. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.* livr. lxxv. vol. xiv. p. 10. *Brussels* edition in 8vo.]

[z] These accounts are drawn from the most authentic sources, and also from the eminent writers, whose authority I made use of, and whose names I mentioned in that part of the preceding century that corresponds with the subject here treated.

III. The

III. The revolution, that this odious rebellion caused in the empire, was, however much less favourable to the views of PASCAL than that lordly pontiff expected. HENRY V could by no means be persuaded to renounce his right of *investing* the bishops and abbots, though he was willing to grant the right of election to the *canons* and *monks*, as was usual before his time. Upon this the exasperated pontiff renewed, in the councils of *Guastalla* and *Troyes*, the decrees that had so often been issued out against *investitures*, and the flame broke out with new force. It was, indeed, suspended during a few years by the wars in which HENRY V was engaged, and which prevented his bringing the matter to an issue. But no sooner had he made peace with his enemies, and composed the tumults that troubled the tranquillity of the empire, than he set out for *Italy* with a formidable army, A. D. 1110, in order to put an end to this long and unhappy contest. He advanced towards *Rome* by slow marches, while the trembling pontiff seeing himself destitute of all succour, and reduced to the lowest and most defenceless condition, proposed to him the following conditions of peace: That he, on the one hand, should renounce the right of *investing* with the *ring* and *crozier*; and that the bishops and abbots should, on the other hand, resign and give over to the emperor all the grants they had received from CHARLEMAGNE, of those rights and privileges that belong to royalty, such as the power of raising tribute, coining money, and possessing independent lands and territories, with other immunities of a like nature. These conditions were agreeable to HENRY, who accordingly gave a formal consent to them in the year 1111; but they were extremely displeasing to the Italian and German bishops, who expressed their dissent in the strongest terms. Hence a terrible tumult arose in the church of St. PETER, where the contending parties were assembled with their respective followers, upon which HENRY ordered the pope to be seized, and to be confined in the castle of *Viterbo*. After having lain there for some time, the captive pontiff was engaged, by the unhappy

CENT
XII.The progress
of this debate.

CENT.
XII.

circumstances of his present condition, to enter into a new convention, by which he solemnly receded from the article of the former treaty that regarded *investitures*, and confirmed to the emperor the privilege of inaugurating the bishops and abbots with the *ring* and *crozier*. Thus was the peace concluded, in consequence of which the vanquished pontiff arrayed HENRY with the imperial diadem [a].

Pascal breaks
this conven-
tion and dies.

IV. This transitory peace, which was the fruit of violence and necessity, was followed by greater tumults and more dreadful wars, than had yet afflicted the church. Immediately after the conclusion of this treaty, *Rome* was filled with the most vehement commotions, and a universal cry was raised against the pontiff, who was accused of having violated, in a scandalous manner, the duties and dignity of his station, and of having prostituted the majesty of the church by his ignominious compliance with the demands of the emperor. To appease these commotions, PASCAL assembled, in the year 1112, a council in the church of Lateran, and there not only confessed, with the deepest contrition and humility, the fault he had committed in concluding such a convention with the emperor, but submitted moreover the decision of that matter to the determination of the council, who accordingly took that treaty into consideration, and solemnly annulled it [b]. This step was followed by many events that gave, for a long time, an unfavourable turn to the affairs of the emperor. He was excommunicated in many synods and councils both in *France* and *Germany*; nay, he was placed in the black list of *heretics*, a denomination, which exposed to the greatest dangers in these superstitious and barbarous

[a] Besides the writers already mentioned, see MABILLON *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. p. 681. and tom. vi. p. 1. at the particular years, to which the events here taken notice of, belong.

[b] PASCAL, upon this occasion, as GREGORY VII had formerly done in the case of BERENGER, submitted his proceedings and his authority to the judgment of a council, to which, of consequence, he acknowledged his subordination. Nay still more, that council condemned his measures, and declared them scandalous.

times [c]; and, to complete his anxiety, he saw the German princes revolting from his authority in several places, and taking up arms in the cause of the church. To put an end to the calamities that thus afflicted the empire on all sides, HENRY set out a second time for *Italy*, with a numerous army, in the year 1116, and arrived the year following at *Rome*, where he assembled the consuls, senators, and nobles, while the fugitive pontiff retired to *Benevento*. PASCAL, however, during this forced absence, engaged the Normans to come to his assistance, and, encouraged by the prospect of immediate succour, prepared every thing for a vigorous war against the emperor, and attempted to make himself master of *Rome*. But in the midst of these warlike preparations, which drew the attention of *Europe* and portended great and remarkable events, the military pontiff yielded to fate, and concluded his days A. D. 1118.

V. A few days after the death of PASCAL, JOHN of *Gaieta*, a Benedictine monk of *Montcassin*, and chancellor of the Roman church, was raised to the pontificate under the title of GELASIUS II. In opposition to this choice, HENRY elected to the same high dignity MAURICE BURDIN, archbishop of *Braga* in *Spain* [d], who assumed the denomination of GREGORY VIII [e]. Upon this, GELASIUS, not thinking himself safe at *Rome*, nor indeed in *Italy*, set out for *France*, and in a little time after died at *Clugni*. The *Cardinals*, who accompanied him in this journey, elected to the papacy, immediately after his departure, GUY archbishop of *Vienne*, count of *Burgundy*, who was nearly related to the emperor, and is distinguished in the list of the Roman pontiffs, by the name of CALLIXTUS II. The ele-

[c] See GERVAISE, *Diff. sur l'Hereſie des investitures*, which is the fourth of the *Dissertations* which he has prefixed to his *History of the Abbot Suger*.

[(d) *Braga* was the metropolis of ancient *Galicia*, but at present is one of the three archbishoprics of *Portugal*, in the province of *Entre Duero e Migno*. The archbishop of that see claims the title of primate of *Spain*, which is annexed in *Spain* to the see of *Toledo*.]

[e] See STEPHANI BALUZII *Vita Mauricii Burdini Miscellaneor.* tom. iii. p. 471.

CENT.
XII.

vation of this eminent ecclesiastic was, in the issue, extremely happy both for church and state. Remarkably distinguished by his illustrious birth, and still more by his noble and heroic qualities, this magnanimous pontiff continued to oppose the emperor with courage and success, and to carry on the war both with the sword of the spirit, and with the arm of flesh. He made himself master of *Rome*, threw into prison the pontiff that had been chosen by the emperor, and fomented the civil commotions in *Germany*. But his fortitude and resolution were tempered with moderation, and accompanied with a spirit of generosity and compliance, which differed much from the obstinate arrogance of his lordly predecessors. Accordingly, he lent an ear to pacific counsels, and was willing to relinquish a part of the demands upon which the former pontiffs had so vehemently insisted, that he might restore the public tranquillity, and satisfy the ardent desires of so many nations, who groaned under the dismal effects of these deplorable divisions [*f*].

It will appear unquestionably evident to every attentive and impartial observer of things, that the illiberal and brutish manners of those who ruled the church were the only reason that rendered the dispute concerning *investitures* so violent and cruel, so tedious in its duration, and so unhappy in its effects. During the space of five and fifty years, the church was governed by monks, who, to the obscurity of their birth, the asperity of their natural temper, and the unbounded rapacity of their ambition and avarice, joined that inflexible obstinacy which is one of the essential characteristics of the monastic order. Hence those bitter feuds, those furious efforts of ambition and vengeance that dishonoured the church and afflicted the state during the course of this controversy. But as soon as the papal chair was filled by a man of an ingenuous turn, and of a liberal education, the face of things changed entirely, and a pro-

[*f*] The paragraph following is the note [*t*] of the original placed in the text.

spect of peace arose to the desires and hopes of ruined and desolate countries. CENT.
XII.

VI. These hopes were not disappointed; for after much contestation, peace was, at length, concluded between the emperor and the pope's legates at a general diet held at *Worms* A. D. 1122. The conditions were as follows:

Peace is concluded between the pope and the emperor upon certain conditions.

“ That for the future the bishops and abbots shall be chosen by those to whom the right of election belongs [g]; but that this election shall be made in presence of the emperor, or of an ambassador appointed by him for that purpose [h]:

“ That in case a dispute arise among the electors, the decision of it shall be left to the emperor, who is to consult with the bishops upon that occasion:

“ That the bishop or abbot elect shall take an oath of allegiance to the emperor, receive from his hand the *regalia*, and do homage for them:

“ That the emperor shall no more confer the *regalia* by the ceremony of the *ring* and *crozier*, which are the ensigns of a spiritual and ghostly dignity, but by that of the *scepter*, which is more proper to invest the person elected in the possession of rights and privileges merely temporal [i].”

This convention was solemnly confirmed the year following in the general council of Lateran, and remains still in force in our times; though the true sense of some of its articles has occasioned disputes between the emperors and pontiffs [k].

VII. CAL-

[[g] The expression is ambiguous, but it signifies that the election of bishops and abbots was to be made by monks and canons as in former times.]

[h] From this period the people in *Germany* were excluded from the right of voting in the election of bishops. See PETR. DE MARCA *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. vi. cap. ii. § 9. p. 783. ed. *Bobmeri*.

[i] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. med. ævi*, tom. vi. p. 76.—SCHILTERUS *De Libertate Eccl. Germanicæ*, lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 545.—CÆSAR RASPONUS *De Basilica Lateranensi*, lib. iv. 295.

[k] It was disputed among other things, whether the consecration

of

CENT.
XII.

Two popes
raised at
the same
time to the
pontificate.

VII. CALLIXTUS did not long enjoy the fruits of this peace, to which he had so much contributed by his prudence and moderation. He departed this life in the year 1124, and was succeeded by LAMBERT, bishop of *Ostia*, who assumed the title of HONORIUS II. and under whose pontificate nothing worthy of mention, was transacted. His death, which happened A. D. 1130, gave rise to a considerable schism in the church of *Rome*, or rather in the college of cardinals, of whom one party elected to the papal chair, GREGORY, a cardinal deacon of *St. Angelo*, who was distinguished by the name of INNOCENT II, while the other chose for successor to HONORIUS, PETER, the son of LEO, a Roman prince, under the title of ANACLETUS II. The party of INNOCENT was far from being numerous in *Rome*, or throughout *Italy* in general, for which reason he judged it expedient to retire into *France*, where he had many adherents, and where he sojourned during the space of two years. His credit was very great out of *Italy*; for besides the emperor LOTHARIUS, the kings of *England*, *France*, and *Spain*, with other princes, espoused warmly the cause of INNOCENT, and that principally by the influence of St. BERNARD, who was his intimate friend, and whose counsels had the force and authority of laws in almost all the countries of *Europe*. The patrons of ANACLETUS were fewer in number, and were confined to the kings of *Sicily* and *Scotland*; his death, however, which happened A. D. 1138, terminated the contest, and left INNOCENT in the entire and undisputed possession of the apostolic chair. The surviving pontiff presided in the year 1139. at the second council of *Lateran*, and about four years after ended his days in peace [1].

of the bishop elect was to precede, or follow the collation of the regalia? See JO. WILH. HOFFMAN. *ad concordatum Henrici V et Callisti II, Vitemberg.* 1739, in 4to.

[1] Besides the ordinary writers of the papal history, see JEAN DE LANNES *Histoire du Pontificat du Pape Innocent II.* Paris. 1741, in 8vo.

VIII. After

VIII. After the death of INNOCENT, the Roman see CENT. was filled by GUY, cardinal of *St. Mark*, who ruled XII.

the church about five months, under the title of CELESTINE II. If his reign was short, it was however peaceable, and not like that of his successor LUCIUS II, whose pontificate was disturbed by various tumults and seditions, and who, about eleven months after his elevation to the papacy, was killed in a riot which he was endeavouring to suppress by his presence and authority. He was succeeded by BERNARD, a Cistercian monk, and an eminent disciple of the famous St. BERNARD, abbot of *Clairval*. This worthy ecclesiastic, who is distinguished among the popes by the title of EUGENIUS III, was raised to that high dignity in the year 1145, and, during the space of nine years, was involved in the same perils and perplexities that had embittered the ghostly reign of his predecessor. He was often obliged to leave *Rome*, and to save himself by flight from the fury of the people [*m*], and the same reason engaged him to retire into *France*, where he sojourned for a considerable time. At length exhausted by the opposition he met with in supporting what he looked upon as the prerogatives of the papacy, he departed this life in the year 1153. The pontificate of his successor CONRAD, bishop of *Sabino*, who, after his elevation to the see of *Rome*, assumed the title of ANASTASIUS IV, was less disturbed by civil commotions, but it was also of a very short duration; for ANASTASIUS died about a year and four months after his election.

IX. The warm contest between the emperors and the popes, which was considered as at an end ever since the time of CALLIXTUS II, was unhappily renewed under

The contest between the emperors and popes is renewed under Frederic Barbarossa and Adrian IV.

[(*m*) There was a party formed in *Rome* at this time, whose design was to restore the Roman senate to its former privileges and to its ancient splendor and glory; and, for this purpose, to reduce the papal revenues and prerogatives to a narrower compass, even to the tithes and oblations that were offered to the primitive bishops, and to the spiritual government of the church, attended with an utter exclusion from all civil jurisdiction over the city of *Rome*. It was this party that produced the feuds and seditions to which Dr. MOSHEIM has an eye in the eighth section.]

the

CENT.
XII.

the pontificate of ADRIAN IV, who was a native of *England*, and whose original name was NICOLAS BREAKSPEAR. FREDERIC I, surnamed *Barbarossa*, was no sooner seated on the imperial throne, than he publicly declared his resolution to maintain the dignity and privileges of the Roman empire in general, and more particularly to render it respectable in *Italy*; nor was he at all studious to conceal the design he had formed of reducing the overgrown power and opulence of the pontiffs and clergy within narrower limits. ADRIAN perceived the danger that threatened the majesty of the church, and the authority of the clergy, and prepared himself for defending both with vigour and constancy. The first occasion of trying their strength was offered at the coronation of the emperor at *Rome*, in the year 1155, when the pontiff insisted upon FREDERIC's performing the office of equerry, and holding the stirrup to his Holiness. This humbling proposal was at first rejected with disdain by the emperor, and was followed by other contests of a more momentous nature relating to the political interests of the empire. These differences were no sooner reconciled than new disputes equally important arose in the year 1158, when the emperor, in order to put a stop to the enormous opulence of the pontiffs, bishops, and monks, which increased from day to day, enacted a law to prevent the transferring of *fiefs* without the knowledge and consent of the superior or lord in whose name they were held [n], and turned the whole force of his arms to reduce the little republics of *Italy* under his dominion. An open rupture between the emperor and the pontiff was expected as the inevitable consequence of such vigorous measures, when the death of ADRIAN, which happened on the

[n] This prohibition of transferring the possession of *fiefs*, from one to another without the consent of the supreme lord, or sovereign, under whom they were held, together with other laws of a like nature, was the first effectual barrier that was opposed to the enormous and growing opulence and authority of the clergy. See MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 239.

first of September, A. D. 1159, suspended the storm CENT.
XII.

[o]. X. In the election of a new pontiff the cardinals were divided into two factions. The most numerous and powerful of the two raised to the pontificate ROLAND, bishop of *Sienna*, who assumed the name of ALEXANDER III, while the opposite party elected to that high dignity OCTAVIAN, cardinal of *St. Cecilia*, known by the title of VICTOR IV. The latter was patronised by the emperor, to whom ALEXANDER was extremely disagreeable on several accounts. The council of *Pavia*, which was assembled by the emperor in the year 1160, adopted his sentiments, and pronounced in favour of VICTOR, who became thereby triumphant in *Germany* and *Italy*; so that *France* alone was left open to ALEXANDER, who accordingly left *Rome*, and fled thither for safety and protection. Amidst the tumults and commotions which this schism occasioned, VICTOR died at *Lucca* in the year 1164, but his place was immediately filled by the emperor, at whose desire GUY, cardinal of *St. Calixtus*, was elected pontiff under the title of PASCAL III, and acknowledged in that character by the German princes assembled in the year 1167, at the diet of *Wurtzburg*. In the mean time ALEXANDER recovered his spirits, and returning into *Italy* maintained his cause with uncommon resolution and vigour, and not without some promising hopes of success. He held at *Rome*, in the year 1167, the council of Lateran, in which he solemnly deposed the emperor (whom he had, upon several occasions before this period, loaded publicly with anathemas and execrations) dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken to him as their lawful sovereign, and encouraged and exhorted them to rebel against his authority, and to shake off his yoke. But soon after this audacious proceeding, the emperor made himself master of *Rome*, upon which the insolent

A dispute arises in the election of a new pontiff.

[o] See the accurate and circumstantial account of this whole affair that is given by the illustrious and learned count BUNAU, in his *History of Frederic I*, wrote in German, p. 45. 49. 73. 99. 105, &c.

CENT.
XII.

pontiff fled to *Benevento*, and left the apostolic chair to PASCAL, his competitor.

XI. The affairs of ALEXANDER seemed to take soon after a more prosperous turn, when the greatest part of the imperial army being consumed by a pestilential disorder, the emperor was forced to abandon *Italy*, and when the death of PASCAL, which happened in the year 1168, delivered him from such a powerful and formidable rival. But this fair prospect soon vanished. For the imperial faction elected to the pontificate JOHN, abbot of *Strum*, under the title of CALLIXTUS III, whom FREDERIC, notwithstanding his absence in *Germany*, and the various wars and disputes in which he was involved, supported to the utmost of his power. When peace was, in a good measure, restored in the empire, FREDERIC marched into *Italy*, A. D. 1174, with a design to chastise the perfidy of the states and cities that had revolted during his absence, and seized the first favorable opportunity of throwing off his yoke. Had this expedition been crowned with the expected success, ALEXANDER would, undoubtedly, have been obliged to desist from his pretensions, and to yield the papal chair to CALLIXTUS. But the event came far short of the hopes which this grand expedition had excited, and the emperor, after having, during the space of three years, been alternately defeated and victorious, was, at length, so fatigued with the hardships he had suffered, and so dejected at a view of the difficulties he had yet to overcome, that, in the year 1177, he concluded a treaty of peace at *Venice* with ALEXANDER III, and a truce with the rest of his enemies [p]. Certain writers affirm,

[p] All the circumstances of these conventions are accurately related by the abovementioned Count BUNAU, in his *History of Frederic I*, p. 115 - 242. - See also FORTUNATI OLMI *Istoria de la Venuta à Venetia occultamente nel A. 1177, di Papa Alessandro III, Venit 1629*, in 4to - MURATORI *Antiqq. Italicæ mediæ ævi*, tom. iv. p. 249, - *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. ii. p. 379. - *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. April. p. 46 in *Vita Hugonis, abbatis Bonæ vallis*, & tom. ii. April. in *Vita Galdini Mediolanensis*, p. 596 two famous ecclesiastics, who were employed as ambassadors and arbiters in the treaty of peace here mentioned.

that

that upon this occasion the haughty pontiff trod upon the neck of the suppliant emperor, while he kissed his foot, repeating at the same time those words of the royal Psalmist : *Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder : the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet* [q]. The greatest part, however, of modern authors have called this event in question, and considered it as utterly destitute of authority and unworthy of credit [r].

XII. ALEXANDER III. who was rendered so famous by his long and successful contest with FREDERIC I, was also engaged in a warm dispute with HENRY II, king of *England*, which was occasioned by the arrogance of THOMAS BECKET, archbishop of *Canterbury*. In the council of *Clarendon*, which was held in the year 1164, several laws were enacted, by which the king's power and jurisdiction over the clergy were accurately explained, and the rights and privileges of the bishops and priests reduced within narrower bounds, [s]. BECKET refused

C E N T.
XII.

A misunderstanding arises between Alexander III and Henry II king of *England*.

[q] Psalm xci. 13.

[r] See BUNAU's *Life of Frederic I*, p. 242—HEUMANNI *Pœciles* tom. iii. lib. i. p. 145.—*Bibliothèque Italique* tom. vi. p. 5. as also the authors mentioned by CASPAR. SAGITTAIUS, in his *Introduct. in Hist. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 630. tom. ii. p. 600.

[s] See MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major.* p. 82, 83. 101. 114.—DAV. WILKINS, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i. p. 434.

[HENRY II had formed the wise project of bringing the clergy under the jurisdiction of the civil courts, on account of the scandalous abuse they had made of their immunities, and the crimes which the ecclesiastical tribunals let pass with impunity. The *Constitutions of Clarendon*, which consisted of xvi articles, were drawn up for this purpose: And as they are proper to give the reader a just idea of the prerogatives and privileges that were claimed equally by the king and the clergy, and that occasioned, of consequence, such warm debates between state and church, it will not be altogether useless to transcribe them here at length.

I. When any difference relating to the right of patronage arises between the *laity*, or between the *clergy* and *laity*, the controversy is to be tried and ended in the *King's Court*.

II. Those churches which are *fees* of the crown cannot be granted away in perpetuity without the king's consent.

III. When the *clergy* are charged with any misdemeanor, and summoned by the justiciary, they shall be obliged to make their appearance in his court, and plead to such parts of the indictment as shall be put

CENT.
XII.

refused obedience to these laws, which he looked upon as prejudicial to the *divine* rights of the church in gene-

to them; and likewise to answer such articles in the Ecclesiastical Court as they shall be prosecuted for by that jurisdiction: Always provided that the king's justiciary shall send an officer to inspect the proceedings of the Court Christian. And in case any *clerk* is convicted, or pleaded guilty, he is to forfeit the privilege of his character, and to be protected by the church no longer.

IV. No archbishops, bishops, or parsons are allowed to depart the kingdom, without a licence from the crown: and, provided they have leave to travel, they shall give security, not to act or solicit any thing during their passage, stay, or return, to the prejudice of the king, or kingdom.

V. When any of the laity are prosecuted in the Ecclesiastical Court, the charge ought to be proved before the bishop by legal and reputable witnesses: and the course of the process is to be so managed, that the archdeacon may not lose any part of his right, or the profits accruing to his office: and if any offenders appear screened from prosecution upon the score either of favour or quality, the sheriff, at the bishop's instance, shall order twelve sufficient men of the neighbourhood to make oath before the bishop, that they will discover the truth according to the best of their knowledge.

VI. Excommunicated persons shall not be obliged to make oath, or give security to continue upon the place where they live: but only to abide by the judgment of the church in order to their absolution.

VII. No person that *holds in chief of the king*, or any of his barons, shall be excommunicated, or any of their estates put under an *interdict*, before application made to the king, provided he is in the kingdom; and in case his highness be out of *England*, then the justiciary must be acquainted with the dispute, in order to make satisfaction: and thus what belongs to the cognizance of the King's Court, must be tried there; and that which belongs to the Court Christian, must be remitted to that jurisdiction.

VIII. In case of appeals in ecclesiastical causes, the first step is to be made from the archdeacon to the bishop: and from the bishop to the archbishop: and, if the archbishop fails to do justice, a farther recourse may be had to the king, by whose order the controversy is to be finally decided in the Archbishop's Court. Neither shall it be lawful for either of the parties to move for any farther remedy without leave from the crown.

IX. If a difference happens to arise between any clergyman and layman concerning any tenement; and that the clerk pretends it held by *frank-almoine**, and the layman pleads it a *lay-fee*; in this case the tenure shall be tried by the enquiry and verdict of twelve sufficient men of the neighbourhood, summoned according to the custom of the realm. And, if the tenement or thing in controversy shall be found *frank-almoine*, the dispute concerning it shall be tried in the Ecclesiastical Court.

* *i. e.* A tenure by divine service, as *Britton* explains it.

But,

ral, and to the prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs in particular. Upon this there arose a violent debate between

CENT.
XII.

the
But, if it is brought in a *lay-fee*, the suit shall be followed in the King's Courts, unless both the plaintiff and defendant hold the tenement in question of the same bishop; in which case, the cause shall be tried in the court of such bishop or baron, with this farther proviso, that he who is seized of the thing in controversy, shall not be disseized hanging the suit (*i. e. during the suit, pendente lite*) upon the score of the verdict abovementioned.

X. He who holds of the king in any city, castle, or borough, or resides upon any of the demesne-lands of the crown, in case he is cited by the archdeacon or bishop to answer any misbehaviour belonging to their cognizance; if he refuses to obey their summons, and stand to the sentence of the court, it shall be lawful for the ordinary to put him under an interdict, but not to excommunicate him, till the king's principal officer of the town shall be preacquainted with the case, in order to enjoin him to make satisfaction to the church. And, if such officer or magistrate shall fail in his duty, he shall be fined by the king's judges. And then the bishop may exert his discipline on the refractory person as he thinks fit.

XI. All archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastical persons, who hold of the king in chief, and the tenure of a barony, are for that reason obliged to appear before the king's justices and ministers to answer the duties of their tenure, and to observe all the usages and customs of the realm; and, like other barons, are bound to be present at trials in the King's Court, till sentence is to be pronounced for the losing of life or limbs.

XII. When any archbishoprick, abby, or priory of royal foundation becomes vacant, the king is to make seizure: from which time, all the profits and issues are to be paid into the Exchequer, as if they were the demesne-lands of the crown. And when it is determined, the vacancy shall be filled up, the king is to summon the most considerable persons of the chapter to Court, and the election is to be made in the chapel royal, with the consent of our sovereign lord the king, and by the advice of such persons of the government, as his highness shall think fit to make use of. At which time, the person elected, before his consecration, shall be obliged to do homage and fealty to the king, as his liege lord; which homage shall be performed in the usual form, with a clause for the saving the privilege of his order.

XIII. If any of the temporal barons, or great men, shall encroach upon the rights or property of any archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, and refuse to make satisfaction for wrong done by themselves, or their tenants, the king shall do justice to the party aggrieved. And, if any person shall disseize the king of any part of his lands, or trespass upon his prerogative, the archbishops, bishops, and archdeacons shall call him to an account, and oblige him to make the crown restitution. *i. e. They were to excommunicate such disseizers and injurious persons in case they proved refractory and incorrigible.*

XIV. The goods and chattels of those who lie under forfeitures of felony

CENT.
XII.

the resolute monarch and the rebellious prelate, which obliged the latter to retire into *France*, where ALEXANDER III was at that time in a kind of exile. This pontiff and the king of *France* interposed their good offices in order to compose these differences, in which they succeeded so far, after much trouble and difficulty, as to encourage BECKET to return into *England*, where he was re-instated in his forfeited dignity. But the generous and indulgent proceedings of his sovereign towards him were not sufficient to conquer his arrogant and rebellious obstinacy in maintaining, what he called, the privileges of the church, nor could he be induced, by any means, to comply with the views and measures of HENRY. The consequences of this inflexible resistance were fatal to the haughty prelate, for he was soon, after his return into *England*, assassinated before the altar while he was at vespers in his cathedral by four persons who certainly did not commit this act of violence without the king's knowledge and connivance [†]. This

felony or treason are not to be detained in any church or church-yard to secure them against seizure and justice; because such goods are the king's property, whether they are lodged within the precincts of a church or without it.

XV. All actions and pleas of debt, though never so solemn in the circumstances of the contract, shall be tried in the King's Courts.

XVI. The sons of copy-holders are not to be ordained without the consent of the lord of the manor where they were born.

Such were the articles of the constitutions of *Clarendon*, against the greatest part of which the pope protested. They were signed by the English clergy and also by BECKET. The latter, however, repented of what he had done, and retiring from court, suspended himself from his office in the church for about forty days, till he received absolution from ALEXANDER III, who was then at *Sens*. His aversion to these articles manifested itself by an open rebellion against his sovereign, in which he discovered his true character, as a most daring, turbulent, vindictive, and arrogant priest, whose ministry was solely employed in extending the despotic dominion of *Rome*, and whose fixed purpose was to aggrandize the church upon the ruins of the state. See COLLIER'S *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. xiith century. RAPIN THOYRAS, in the reign of HENRY II.]

[(†) This assertion is, in our opinion, by much too strong. It can only be founded upon certain indiscreet and passionate expressions, which the intolerable insolence and frenetic obstinacy of BECKET drew from HENRY in an unguarded moment, when, after having received new affronts

vent produced warm debates between the king of *England* and the Roman pontiff, who gained his point so far as to make the suppliant monarch undergo a severe course of penance in order to expiate a crime of which he was considered as the principal promoter, while the murdered prelate was solemnly enrolled in the highest rank of saints and martyrs in the year 1173 [u].

XIII. It was not only by force of arms, but also by uninterrupted efforts of dexterity and artifice, by wise counsels and prudent laws, that ALEXANDER III main-

CENT.
XII.

Alexander III contributes by prudent counsels to confirm the privileges of the church, and to extend the papal autho-

fronTS, notwithstanding the reconciliation he had effected with so much trouble and condescension, he expressed himself to this purpose:

Am I not unhappy that, among the numbers, who are attached to my interests, and employed in my service, there is none possessed of spirit enough to resent the affronts which I am constantly receiving from a miserable priest?

These words, indeed, were not pronounced in vain. Four gentlemen of the court, whose names were *Fitz-Urse, Tracy, Britton, and Morville*, murdered BECKET in his chapel, and thus performed, in a licentious and criminal manner, an action which the laws might have commanded with justice. But it is extremely remarkable, that after the murder the assassins were afraid they had gone too far, and durst not return to the king's court, which was then in *Normandy*; but retired, at first, to *Knareborough* in *Yorkshire*, which belonged to *Morville*, from whence they repaired to *Rome* for absolution, and being admitted to penance by ALEXANDER III, were sent, by the orders of that pontiff, to *Jerusalem*, and passed the remainder of their lives upon the *Black Mountain* in the severest acts of austerity and mortification. All this does not look as if the king had been deliberately concerned in this murder, or had expressly consented to it. See RAPIN THOYRAS, *History of England*; COLLIER'S *Ecclesiastical History of England*, vol. i. p. 370. *

The authors, which Dr. MOSHEIM refers to for an account of this matter, are as follow: GUILIEL. STEPHANIDÆ *Historia Thomæ Cantuariensis* in SPARKS' *Scriptores rerum Anglicarum*, published in folio at London in the year 1723—CHRIST. LUPI. *Epistolæ et vita Thomæ Cantuar.*—*Epistolæ Alexandri III, Ludovici VII, Henrici II, in hac causa ex MSS Vaticano, Bruxellis* 1682, 2 vols. 4to.—NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Seleg. Histor. Eccles. Capitib. Sæc. xii. Diss. x.* p. 833.—THOMÆ STABLETONI *Tres Thomæ, seu res Gestæ Thomæ Apostoli, S. Thomæ Cantuariensis, et Thomæ Mori.* Colon. 1642, in 8vo.]

[u] BOULAY, *Histor. Academ. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 328. et *De Die Festo Ius*, p. 397.—DOM. COLONIA, *Histoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 249.

Dr. SMOLLET tells us, that the king suspecting the design of these four gentlemen by the privacy of their departure from his court, dispatched messengers to overtake, and forbid them, in his name to commit any violence; but the conspirators had already taken shipping, and the orders arrived too late in *England* to prevent their design's being executed. See SMOLLET'S *History of England*, vol. i. p. 332.

CENT.
XII.

tained the pretended rights of the church, and extended the authority of the Roman pontiffs. For in the third council of the Lateran held at *Rome* A. D. 1179, the following decrees, among many others upon different subjects, were passed by his advice and authority: 1st, That in order to put an end to the confusion and dissensions, which so often accompanied the election of the Roman pontiffs, the right of election should not only be vested in the *cardinals* alone, but also that the person, in whose favour two thirds of the college of cardinals voted, should be considered as the lawful and duly elected pontiff. This law is still in force; it was therefore from the time of ALEXANDER that the election of the pope acquired that form which it still retains, and by which not only the people but also the Roman clergy, are excluded entirely from all share in the honour of conferring that important dignity. 2^{dly}, A spiritual war was declared against heretics, whose numbers increasing considerably about this time, created much disturbance in the church in general, and infested, in a more particular manner, several provinces in *France*, which groaned under the fatal dissensions that accompanied the propagation of their errors [w]. 3^{dly}, The right of recommending and nominating to the saintly order was also taken away from councils and bishops, and *canonization* was ranked among the *greater and more important causes*; the cognizance of which belonged to the pontiff alone [x]. To all this we must not forget to add, that the power of erecting new kingdoms, which had been claimed by the pontiffs from the time of GRE-

[w] See NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Select. Histor. Eccles. Capit. Sæc.* xii. *Diff.* ix. p. 819. where he treats particularly concerning this council.—See also *tom. vi. part. II. Conciliorum HARDUINI*, p. 1671.

[(w) Dr. MOSHEIM, as also SPANHEIM and FLEURY, call this the 3d council of Lateran, whereas other historians mention eight preceding councils held in the Lateran, *viz.* Those of the years 649, 864, 1105, 1112, 1116, 1123, 1139, 1167. Our author has also attributed to this council of 1179, decrees that probably belong to a later period.]

[x] See what has been observed already, under the xth century, concerning the election of the popes, and the *canonization* of saints.

GREGORY VII, was not only assumed, but also exercised by ALEXANDER in a remarkable instance; for in the year 1179, he conferred the title of king, with the ensigns of royalty, upon ALPHONSO I, duke of *Portugal*, who, under the pontificate of LUCIUS II, had rendered his province tributary to the Roman see [y].

CENT.
XII.

XIV. Upon the death of ALEXANDER, UBALD, bishop of *Ostia*, otherwise known by the name of LUCIUS III, was raised to the pontificate A. D. 1181, by the suffrages of the cardinals alone, in consequence of the law mentioned in the preceding section. The administration of this new pontiff was embittered by violent tumults and seditions; for he was twice driven out of the city by the Romans, who could not bear a pope that was elected, in opposition to the ancient custom, without the knowledge and consent of the clergy and the people. In the midst of these troubles he died at *Verona* in the year 1185, and was succeeded by HUBERT CRIVELLI, bishop of *Milan*, who assumed the title of URBAN III, and, without having transacted any thing worthy of mention during his short pontificate, died of grief in the year 1187, upon hearing that SALADIN had made himself master of *Jerusalem*. The pontificate of his successor ALBERT [z], whose papal denomination was GREGORY VIII, exhibited a still more striking instance of the fragility of human grandeur; for this pontiff yielded to fate about two months after his elevation. He was succeeded by PAUL, bishop of *Preneſte*, who filled the papal chair above three years under the title of CLEMENT III, and departed this life A. D. 1191, without having distinguished his ghostly reign by any me-

His successors.

[y] BARONIUS, *Annal. ad A. 1179*—INNOCENTII III, *Epistolæ Lib. ep. xlix. p. 54. tom. i. ed. Baluzian.*

[(y) ALPHONSO had been declared by his victorious army, king of *Portugal*, in the year 1136, in the midst of the glorious exploits he had performed in the war against the *Moors*; so that ALEXANDER III did no more than confirm this title by an arrogant bull, in which he treats that excellent prince as his vassal.]

[z] This prelate, before his elevation to the papacy, was bishop of *Benevento*, and chancellor of the Roman church.

CENT.
XII.

morable achievement, if we except his zeal for draining *Europe* of its treasures and inhabitants by the publication of new *crusades*. CELESTINE III [a], makes a more shining figure in history than the pontiffs we have been now mentioning; for he thundered his excommunications against the emperor, HENRY VI, and LEOPOLD, duke of *Austria*, on account of their having seized and imprisoned RICHARD I, king of *England*, as he was returning from the Holy Land; he also subjected to the same malediction ALPHONSO X. king of *Gallicia* and *Leon*, on account of an incestuous marriage into which that prince had entered, and commanded PHILIP AUGUSTUS, king of *France*, to re-admit to the conjugal state and honours INGELBURG his queen, whom he had divorced for reasons unknown; though this order, indeed, produced but little effect [b]. But the most illustrious and resolute pontiff, that filled the papal chair during this century, and whose exploits made the greatest noise in *Europe*, was LOTHARIUS, count of *Segni*, cardinal deacon, otherwise known by the name of INNOCENT III. The arduous undertakings, and bold achievements of this eminent pontiff, who was placed at the head of the church in the year 1198, belong to the history of the following century.

A view of
the other eccle-
siastical
orders, and
their vices.

XV. If from the series of pontiffs that ruled the church in this century, we descend to the other ecclesiastical orders, such as the bishops, priests, and deacons, the most disagreeable objects will be exhibited to our view. The unanimous voice of the historians of this age, as well as the laws and decrees of synods and councils declare loudly the gross ignorance, the odious frauds, and the flagitious crimes that reigned among the different ranks and orders of the clergy now mentioned. It is not therefore at all surprizing, that the monks,

[a] Whose name was HYACINTH, a native of *Rome*, and a cardinal deacon.

[(b) It was in consequence of the vigorous and terrible proceedings of INNOCENT III, that the reunion between PHILIP and INGELBURG was accomplished. See *L'Histoire de France, par l'Abbé Velly*, tom. iii. p 367, 368, 369.]

whose

whose rules of discipline obliged them to a regular method of living, and placed them out of the way of many temptations to licentiousness, and occasions of sinning to which the episcopal and sacerdotal orders were exposed, were held in higher esteem than they were. The reign of corruption became, however, so general, that it reached at last even the convents; and the monks, who were gaining with the most ardent efforts the summit of ecclesiastical power and authority, and who beheld both the *secular clerks*, and the *regular canons* with aversion and contempt [c], began in many places, to degenerate from that sanctity of manners, and that exact obedience to their rules of discipline by which they had been formerly distinguished, and to exhibit to the people scandalous examples of immorality and vice [d]. The Benedictines of *Clugni*, who undoubtedly surpassed, in regularity of conduct and purity of manners all the monastic orders who lived under their rule, maintained their integrity for a long time amidst the general decay of piety and virtue. They were however at length carried away with the torrent; seduced by the example of their abbot PONTIUS, and corrupted by the treasures that were poured daily into their convent by the liberality of the opulent and pious, they fell from their primitive austerity, and, following the dissolute examples of the other Benedictines, they *gave themselves up to pleasure and dwelt carelessly* [e]. Several of the succeeding abbots endeavoured to remedy this disorder, and to recover the declining reputation of their convent; but their efforts were much less successful than they expected, nor could the monks of *Clugni* ever be

[c] See RUPERTI *Epistola* in MARTENE *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. i. p. 285. This writer prefers the monks before the apostles.

[d] See BERNARD. *Consideration. ad Eugenium*, lib. iii. cap. iv.—See also the *Speculum Stultorum*, or *Brunellus*, a poem, composed by NIGEL WIREKER, an English bard of no mean reputation, who lived about the middle of the XIIth century. In this poem, of which several editions have been published; the different orders of monks are severely censured; the Carthusians alone have escaped the keen and virulent Satire of this witty writer.

[e] ISAIAH xlvii. 8.

CENT. brought back to their primitive sanctity and virtue
XII. [f].

The prosperous state of the Cistercian Order.

XVI. The *Cistercian Order*, which was much inferior to the monks of *Clugni*, both with respect to the antiquity of their institution, and the possessions and revenues of their convent, surpassed them far in the external regularity of their lives and manners, and in a certain striking air of innocence and sanctity which they still retained, and which the others had almost entirely lost. Hence they acquired that high degree of reputation and authority, which the order of *Clugni* had formerly enjoyed, and increased daily in number, credit, and opulence. The famous St. BERNARD, abbot of *Clairval*, whose influence throughout all *Europe* was incredible, whose word was a law, and whose counsels were regarded by kings and princes as so many orders to which the most respectful obedience was due; this eminent ecclesiastic was the person who contributed most to enrich and aggrandize the Cistercian Order. Hence he is justly considered as the second parent and founder of that Order; and hence the Cistercians not only in *France*, but also in *Germany*, and other countries were distinguished by the title of *Bernardin monks* [g]. A hundred and sixty religious communities derive their origin, or their rules of discipline, from this illustrious abbot, and he left, at his death, seven hundred monks in the monastery of *Clairval*. The church abounded with bishops and archbishops that had been formed and prepared for the ministry by his instructions, and he counted also, among the number of his disciples, EUGENIUS III; one of the best and wisest of the Roman pontiffs.

Jealousies arise between the Cistercians and the monks of *Clugni*.

XVII. The growing prosperity of the *Cistercian Order*, excited the envy and jealousy of the monks of *Clugni*, and, after several dissensions of less consequence, produced at length an open rupture, a declared war be-

[f] See MARTENE *Amplissima Collectio Monumentor. Veter.* tom. ix. p. 1119.

[g] See JO. MABILLON, *Annal. Ordin. Benedict.* tom. vi. passim, in *vita Sti. Bernardi*, which he has prefixed to his edition of the works of that saint.—See also ANGELI MANRIQUEZ, *Annales Cistercienses*, tom. ii, and iii.

tween

tween these two opulent and powerful monasteries. They both followed the rule of St. BENEDICT, though they differed in their habit, and in certain laws, which the Cistercians, more especially, had added to that rule. The monks of *Clugni* accused the *Cistercians* of affecting an extravagant austerity in their manners and discipline; while the *Cistercians*, on the other hand, charged them, and that upon very good grounds, with having degenerated from their former sanctity, and regularity of conduct. St. BERNARD, who was the oracle and protector of the Cistercians, wrote, in the year 1127, an *Apology* for his own conduct in relation to the division that subsisted between the two convents, and inveighed with a just, though decent, severity against the vices that had corrupted the monks of *Clugni* [b]. This charge was answered, though with uncommon moderation and candour by PETER MAURITIUS, abbot of *Clugni*; and hence it occasioned a controversy in form, which spread from day to day its baneful influence, and excited disturbances in several provinces of *Europe* [i]. It was, however, followed with a much more vehement and bitter con-

[(b) This apology, as it is called, of St. BERNARD is well worth the attention of the curious reader, as it exhibits a true and lively picture of monastic opulence and luxury, and shews how the religious orders in general lived in this century. The famous abbot, in this performance, accuses the monks of *Clugni* of luxury and intemperance at their table, of superfluity and magnificence in their dress, their bed-chambers, their furniture, equipage, and buildings. He points out the pride and vanity of the abbots, who looked much liker the governors of provinces, than the spiritual fathers of humble and holy communities, whose original profession it was, to be crucified and dead to the interests and pleasures, the pomps and vanities of a present world. He declares, with a pious concern, that he knew several abbots, each of whom had more than sixty horses in his stable, and such a prodigious variety of wines in his cellar, that it was scarcely possible to taste the half of them at a single entertainment. See FLEURY, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, livr. lxxvii. tom. xiv. p. 351. edit. *Bruxelles*.

[i] See S. BERNARDINI *Apologia* in *Oper.* tom. i. p. 523—533.—The *Apology* of PETER, abbot of *Clugni*, surnamed the *Venerable*, which is published among his *Epistles*, lib. i. ep. 28. in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, tom. i. p. 657—695.—See also the *Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem*, published by MARTENE, in his *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 1573—1613.—Compare with all these MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 80. & MANRIQUEZ, *Annal. Cisterc.* tom. i. p. 28.

test

CENT.
XII.

test concerning an exemption from the payment of tithes, granted among other privileges and immunities to the Cistercians, A. D. 1132, by INNOCENT II. A considerable part of the lands, which the Cistercians possessed, and to which the pontiff granted this exemption, were subject to the monks of *Clugni*, who suffered consequently by this act of liberality, and disputed the matter, not only with the Cistercians, but with the pope himself. This keen dispute was, in some measure, terminated in the year 1155, but in what manner, or upon what conditions, is more than is come to our knowledge [k].

Lives and
manners of
the canons.

XVIII. The *regular canons*, who were erected into a fixed and permanent order in the preceding century, employed their time in a much more useful and exemplary manner than the monastic drones, who passed their days in luxury and sloth. They kept public schools for the instruction of youth, and exercised a variety of ecclesiastical functions, which rendered them extremely useful to the church [l]. Hence they rose daily in credit and reputation, received many rich and noble donations from several persons whose opulence and piety rendered them able and willing to distinguish merit, and were also often put in possession of the revenues of the monks, whose dissolute lives occasioned, from time to time, the suppression of their convents. This, as might well be expected, inflamed the rage of the monastic orders against the regular canons, whom they attacked with the greatest fury, and loaded with the bitterest invectives. The canons, in their turn, were far from being backward in making reprisals; they exclaimed, on the contrary, against the monks with the utmost vehemence; enumerated their vices both in their discourses and in their writings, and insisted upon their being confined to their monasteries, se-

[k] See ANGELI MANRIQUEZ, *Annal. Cistercienses*, tom. i. p. 232. — MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 212. 479. & *Præfat. ad Opera S. Bernardi*. JO. DE LANNES, *Histoire du Pontificat d'Innocent II.*, p. 68 — 79. — JO. NIC. HERTII *Diff. de exemptione Cisterc. à decimis*.

[l] See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 112.

queftered

questered from human society, and excluded from all ecclesiastical honours and functions. Hence arose a long and furious contest between the monks and canons concerning pre-eminence, in which both parties carried their pretensions too high, and exceeded the bounds of decency and moderation [m]. The champions, who espoused the interests of the monks, were the famous PETER ABELARD, HUGH of *Amiens*, RUPERT of *Duytz*; while the cause of the canons was defended by PHILIP HARVENGIUS, a learned abbot, and several other men of genius and abilities [n]. The effects and remains of this ancient controversy are yet visible in our times.

XIX. A new society of religious Benedictines arose about the commencement of this century, whose principal monastery was erected in a barren and solitary place, called *Fontevrand*, between *Angers* and *Tours*, from whence the order derived its name. ROBERT of *Arbriselles*, its founder, who had been first an hermit and afterwards a monk, prescribed to his religious of both sexes, the rule of St. BENEDICT, amplified, however, by the addition of several new laws which were extremely singular and excessively severe. Among other singularities that distinguished this institution, one was, that the several monasteries which ROBERT had built, within one and the same enclosure, for his monks and nuns, were all subjected to the authority and government of one abbeſs, in justification of which measure the example of CHRIST was alledged, who recommended St. JOHN to the Virgin MARY, and imposed it as an order upon that beloved disciple to be obedient to her as to his own mother [o]. This new order, like all other novelties of that

New monastic orders.

[m] See LAMBERTI *Epistola* in MARTENE *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. i. p. 329.

[n] ABAELARDI *Opera*, p. 228. *Paris*. 1616, in 4^{to}.—MARTENE, *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 970—975. 1614. et *Amplissima ejusdem Collectio*, tom. ix. p. 971, 972.—PHIL. HARVENGII *Opera*, p. 385. *Duaci* 1621, in folio.

[o] See the *Works* of ABELARD, p. 48. whose testimony, in this matter, is confirmed by the present state and constitution of this famous order; though MABILLON, from an excessive partiality in favour

C E N T.
XII.

that kind, gained immediately a high degree of credit; the singularity of its discipline, its form, and its laws, engaged multitudes to embrace it, and thus the labours of its founder were crowned with remarkable success. [But the association of vigorous monks and tender virgins, in the same community, was an imprudent measure, and could not but be attended with many inconveniencies. However that be, ROBERT continued his pious labours, and the odour of his sanctity perfumed all the places where he exercised his ministry.] He was, indeed, suspected by some, of too great an intimacy with his female disciples; and it was rumoured about, that, in order, to try his virtue by opposing it to the strongest temptations, he exposed it to an inevitable defeat by the manner in which he conversed with these holy virgins. It was even said, that their commerce was softened by something more tender than divine love; against which charge his disciples have used their most zealous endeavours to defend their master [p].

of the Benedictines, has endeavoured to diminish its credit in his *Anal. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 423. For an account of ROBERT and his order, see the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. iii. *Februar.* p. 593.—DION. SAMMARTHANI *Gallia Christiana*, tom. ii. p. 1311.—BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article FONTEVRAUD.—HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vi. p. 83.—The present state of this monastery is described by MOLEON, in his *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 108. and by MARTENE, in his *Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins*, part. II. p. 1.

[p] See the letters of GEOFFRY, abbot of *Vendôme*, and of MARBOD, bishop of *Rennes*, in which ROBERT is accused of lying in the same bed with the nuns. How the grave abbot was defended against this accusation by the members of his order, may be seen in MAINFERME's *Clypeus Nascentis Ordinis Fontebraldensis*, published in 8vo at *Paris* in the year 1684; and also by another production of the same author, entitled, *Dissertationes in Epistolam contra Robertum de Arbrissello*, *Salmurii* 1682, in 8vo. BAYLE's account of this famous abbot, in which there is such an admirable mixture of wit, sense, and malice, has been also attacked by several writers; see among others, the *Dissertation Apologetique pour le bienheureux Robert d'Arbrisselles sur ce qu'en a dit M. Bayle*. *Anvers* 1701. in 8vo.—MABILLON, *Annal.* tom. v. et vi. p. 9, 10.

[(p)] In the year 1177, some nuns of this Order were brought into *England*, at the desire of HENRY II, who gave them the monastery of *Ambresbury* in *Wiltshire*. They had two other houses here; the one at *Eton*, the other at *Westwood* in *Worcestershire*.]

XX. NOR-

XX. NORBERT, a German nobleman, who went in-^{CENT.} to holy orders, and was afterwards archbishop of *Magde-*^{XII.} *bourg*, employed his most zealous efforts to restore to its primitive severity the discipline of the *regular canons*,^{The Order of Premon-} which was extremely relaxed in some places, and almost^{tré.} totally abolished in others. This eminent reformer founded, in the year 1121, the *Order of Premontré* in *Picardy*, whose fame spread throughout *Europe* with an amazing rapidity, and whose opulence, in a short space of time, became excessive and enormous [q], in consequence of the high esteem which the monks of this community had acquired by the gravity of their manners, and their assiduous application to the liberal arts and sciences. But their overgrown prosperity was the source of their ruin, it soon diminished their zeal for the exercises of devotion, extinguished their thirst after useful knowledge, and thus step by step plunged them, at length, into all sorts of vices. The rule which they followed was that of St. AUGUSTIN, with some slight alterations and an addition of certain severe laws, whose authority, however, did not long survive their austere founder [r].

XXI. About

[(q) The *religious* of this Order were at first so poor, that they had nothing they could call their own, but a single ass, which served to carry the wood they cut down every morning and sent to *Laon* in order to purchase bread. But in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that, thirty years after the foundation of this order, they had above an hundred abbies in *France* and *Germany*. In process of time, the Order increased so prodigiously, that it had monasteries in all parts of *Christendom*, amounting to 1000 abbies, 300 provostships, a vast number of priories, and 500 nunneries. But this number is now greatly diminished. Besides what they lost in protestant countries, of sixty-five abbies, that they had in *Italy*, there is not one now remaining.]

[r] See HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 156.—CHRYSOST. Van der STERIE, *Vita S. Norberti Præmonstratensium Patriarchæ*, published in 8vo at *Antwerp* in 1656.—LOUIS HUGUES, *Vie de S. Norbert*, *Luxemb.* 1704, in 4to.—Add to these, notwithstanding his partiality, Jo. LAUNOIUS, *Inquisit. in Privilegia Ordin. Præmonstrat.* cap. i, ii. *Oper.* tom. iii. part. I. p. 448. For an account of the present state of the Order of *Premontré*, see MARTENE'S *Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins*, tom. ii. p. 59.

[(r) The

CENT.
XII.

Carmelites.

XXI. About the middle of this century, a certain Calabrian, whose name was BERTHOLD, set out with a few companions for mount *Carmel*, and, upon the very spot where the prophet ELIAS is said to have disappeared, built an humble cottage, with an adjoining chapel, in which he led a life of solitude, austerity, and labour. This little colony subsisted, and the places of those that died were more than filled by new comers; so that it was, at length [s], erected into a monastic community by ALBERT, patriarch of *Jerusalem*. This austere prelate drew up a rule of discipline for the new monks, which was afterwards confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontiffs, who modified and altered it in several respects, and, among other corrections, mitigated its excessive rigour and severity [t]. Such was the origin of the famous *Order of Carmelites*, or, as they are commonly called, of the *Order of our Lady of mount Carmel*, which was afterwards transplanted from *Syria* into *Europe*, and obtained the principal rank among the mendicant or begging orders. It is true, the Carmelites reject, with the highest indignation, an origin so recent and obscure, and affirm to this very day, that the prophet ELIAS was the parent and founder of their ancient community [u]. Very few, however, have been

[(r) The *Præmonstratenses*, or monks of *Premontré*, vulgarly called *White Canons*, came first into *England* A. D. 1146. Their first monastery, called *New-House*, was built in *Lincolnshire* by *Peter de Saulia*, and dedicated to St. *Martial*. In the reign of EDWARD I, the order in question had twenty-seven monasteries in *England*.]

[s] In the year 1205.

[t] I have here principally followed DAN. PAPEBROCH, an accurate writer, and one who is always careful to produce sufficient testimonies of the truth of his narrations, see the *Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. Mense April*, tom. iii. p. 774 -- 802. It is well known, that an accusation was brought against this learned jesuit before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff by the Carmelites, on account of his having called in question the dignity and high antiquity of their order. We have in HELYOT's *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. i. p. 282. an account of this long and tedious contest, which was so far determined, or at least suspended in the year 1698, by INNOCENT XII, that silence was imposed upon the contending parties.

[u] The most concise and accurate of all the Carmelite writers, who have treated this matter, is THOMAS AQUINAS, a French monk,

been engaged to adopt this fabulous and chimerical account of their establishment; except the members of the order, and many Roman catholic writers have treated their pretensions to such a remote antiquity with the utmost contempt [*w*]. [And scarcely, indeed, can any thing be more ridiculous than the circumstantial narrations of the occasion, origin, founder, and revolutions of this famous order, which we find in several ecclesiastical authors, whose zeal for this fraternity has rendered them capable of adopting without reluctance, or, at least, of reciting without shame the most puerile and glaring absurdities. They tell us, that ELIAS was introduced into the state of monachism by the ministry of angels; that his first disciples were JONAH, MICAH, and also OBADIAH, whose wife, in order to get rid of an importunate croud of lovers, who fluttered about her at the court of ACHAB after the departure of her husband, bound herself by a vow of chastity, received the veil from the hands of *father* ELIAS, and thus became the first abbess of the Carmelite order. They enter into a vast detail of all the circumstances that relate to the rules of discipline, which were drawn up for this community, the habit which distinguished its members, and the various alterations which were introduced into their rule of discipline in process of time. They observe, that, among other marks, which were used to distinguish the Carmelites from the seculars, the *tonsure* was one; that this mark of distinction exposed them, indeed, to the mockeries of a profane multitude; and that this furnishes the true explication of the terms *bald head*, which the children addressed, by way of reproach, to ELISHAH as he was on his way to *Carmel* [*x*]. They tell us, moreover, that PYTHAGORAS was a member of

in his *Dissertatio Hist. Theol. in qua Patriarchatus Ordinis Carmelitarum Prophetæ Eliæ vindicatur*, published in 8vo at Paris, in the year 1632.

The modern writers, who have maintained the cause of the Carmelites against PAPERBROCH, are extremely prolix and tiresome.

[*w*] See HARDUINI *Opera Posthum.* p. 642.—LABAT, *Voyage en Espagne et Italie*, tom. iii. p. 87.—COURAYER, *Examen des défauts Théologiques*, tom. i. p. 455.

[*x*] See 2 KINGS ii. 23.

C E N T.
XII.

this ancient order; that he drew all his wisdom from mount *Carmel*, and had several conversations, with the prophet DANIEL at *Babylon*, upon the subject of the Trinity. Nay, they go still farther into the region of fable, and assert, that the Virgin MARY and JESUS himself assumed the habit and profession of Carmelites; and they load this fiction with a heap of absurd circumstances, which it is impossible to read without the highest astonishment [y].

Greek writers.

XXII. To this brief account of the religious orders, it will not be amiss to add a list of the principal Greek and Latin writers that flourished in this century. The most eminent among the Greeks were those that follow:

PHILIPPUS SOLITARIUS, whose *Dioptra*, or controversy between the soul and the body, is sufficiently known;

EUSTRATIUS, who maintained the cause of the Greek church against the Latins with great learning and

[(y) For an ample account of all the absurd inventions here hinted at, see a very remarkable work, entitled, *ORDRES MONASTIQUES, Histoire extraite de tous les Auteurs qui ont conservé à la Postérité ce qu'il y a de plus curieux dans chaque ordre, enrichie d'un très-grand nombre de passages des memes Auteurs; pour servir de demonstration que ce qu'on y avance est également veritable et curieux.* This work, which was first printed at *Paris* in 1751, under the title of *Berlin*, and which was suppressed almost as soon as it appeared, is written with great wit, eloquence, and learning, and all the narrations it contains are confirmed by citations from the most eminent authors who have given accounts of the religious orders. The author's design seems to have been to expose the monks of every denomination to the laughter of his readers; and it is very remarkable, that, in the execution of this purpose, he has drawn his materials from the gravest authors, and from the most zealous defenders of monachism. If he has embellished his subject, it is by the vivacity of his manner, and the witty elegance of his style, and not by laying to the charge of the monastic communities any practices which their most serious historians omit or disavow. The authors of the *Bibliothèque des Sciences et de Beaux Arts*, at the *Hague*, have given several interesting extracts of this work in the 2, 3, 4, and 5th volumes of that Literary Journal.]

[(y) The Carmelites came into *England* in the year 1240, and erected there a vast number of monasteries almost through the whole kingdom. See BROUGHTON's *Historical Library*, vol. i. p. 208.]

spirit,

spirit, and who wrote commentaries on certain books of ARISTOTLE; C E N T. XII.

EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, who, by his *Anti-heretical Panoply*, together with his commentaries upon several parts of the sacred writings, has acquired a place among the principal authors of this century [z];

JOHANNES ZONARAS, whose *Annals*, together with several other productions of his learned pen, are still extant;

MICHAEL GLYCAS, who also applied himself to historical composition, as well as to other branches of learning [a];

CONSTANTINUS HARMENOPULUS, whose commentaries on the civil and canon laws are deservedly esteemed;

ANDRONICUS CAMATERUS, who wrote with great warmth and vehemence against the Latins and Armenians;

EUSTATHIUS, bishop of *Thessalonica*, the most learned of the Greeks in this century, and the celebrated commentator of the *Iliad*.

THEODORUS BALSAMON, who employed great diligence, erudition, and labour in explaining and digesting the civil and ecclesiastical laws of the Greeks [b].

XXIII. The most eminent among the Latin writers were, Latin writers.

BERNARD, abbot of *Clairval*, from whom the Cistercian monks, as has been already observed, derived the title of *Bernardins*; a man who was not destitute of genius and taste, and whose judgment, in many respects, was just and penetrating; but who, on the other hand, discovered in his conduct many marks of superstition and weakness, and, what was still worse, concealed the lust of dominion under the mask of piety, and made no

[z] See RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, par M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 318. 324.

[a] Other historians place GLYCAS in the xvth century. See LAMI *Dissertatio de Glyca*, which is prefixed to the first volume of his *Deliciae virorum eruditorum*.

[b] See the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

CENT. XII. scruple of loading with false accusations such as had the misfortune to incur his displeasure [c];

INNOCENT III, bishop of *Rome*, whose epistles and other productions contribute to illustrate the religious sentiments, as also the discipline and morals, that prevailed in this century [d];

ANSELM of *Laon*, a man of a subtile genius, and deeply versed in logical disquisition;

ABELARD, the disciple of ANSELM, and most famous in this century on account of the elegance of his wit, the extent of his erudition, the power of his rhetoric, and the bitterness of his unhappy fate [e];

GEOFFRY of *Vendôme*, whose *Epistles* and *Dissertations* are yet extant;

RUPERT of *Duytz*, the most eminent, perhaps, of all the expositors of the holy scriptures, who flourished among the Latins during this century, a man of a sound judgment and an elegant taste [f];

HUGH of *St. Victor*, a man, distinguished by the fecundity of his genius, who treated in his writings of all the branches of sacred and profane erudition, that were known in his time, and who composed several dissertations that are not destitute of merit [g];

RICHARD

[c] The learned MABILLON has given a splendid edition of the works of St. BERNARD, and has not only in his Preface made many excellent observations upon the life and history of this famous abbot, but has also subjoined to his *Works* the accounts that have been given, by the ancient writers, of his life and actions.

[d] The Epistles of INNOCENT III. were published at *Paris*, in two large volumes in folio, by BALUZIUS, in the year 1682.

[e] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the articles ABELARD and PARACLET.—GERVAIS, *Vie de Pierre Abeillard, Abbe de Ruys et de Heloise*, published at *Paris* in two volumes 8vo. in the year 1728. The works of this famous and unfortunate monk were published at *Paris* in 1616, in one volume 4to by FRANC. AMBOISE. Another edition, much more ample, might be given, since there are a great number of the productions of ABELARD that have never yet seen the light.

[f] See MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 19, 20. 42. 144. 168. 261. 282. 296. who gives an ample account of RUPERT, and of the disputes in which he was involved.

[g] See *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 661. The works of this learned man were published at *Rouen*, in three volumes in folio, in the year

RICHARD of *St. Victor*, who was at the head of the CENT.
 Mystics in this century, and whose treatise, entitled, XII.
The Mystical Ark, which contains, as it were, the mar-
 row of that kind of theology, was received with the
 greatest avidity, and applauded by the fanatics of the
 times [b];

HONORIUS of *Autun* [i], no mean philosopher, and
 tolerably versed in theological learning;

GRATIAN, a learned monk, who reduced the canon
 law into a new and regular form, in his vast compila-
 tion of the decisions of the ancient and modern coun-
 cils, the decretals of the pontiffs, the capitularies of
 the kings of *France*, &c.

WILLIAM of *Rheims*, the author of several produc-
 tions, every way adapted to excite pious sentiments,
 and to contribute to the progress of practical religion;

PETER LOMBARD, who was commonly called, in
France, *Master of the Sentences*, because he had compos-
 ed a work so entitled, which was a collection of opi-
 nions and sentences relative to the various branches of
 theology, extracted from the Latin doctors, and redu-
 ced into a sort of system [k];

GILBERTUS PORRETANUS [l], a subtle dialectician,
 and a learned divine, who is, however, said to have
 adopted several erroneous sentiments concerning *The Di-
 vine Essence*; *The Incarnation*; and *The Trinity* [m];

year 1648. See, for a farther account of him, DERLANGII *Dissert.*
de Hugone a S. Victore, Helmstadt. 1746, in 4to. and MARTENE'S
Voyage Litteraire, tom. ii. p. 91, 92.

[b] *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 669.

[i] Such is the place to which HONORIUS is said to have belong-
 ed. But LE BOEUF proves him to have been a German, in his
Dissert. sur l'Hist. Françoise, tom. i. p. 254.

[k] *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 68.

[l] GILBERT, *De la Poireté*.

[m] He held, among other things, this trifling and sophistical propo-
 sition, that *the divine essence and attributes are not God*; a proposition
 that was every way proper to exercise the quibbling spirit of the
 scholastic writers.]

CENT.
XII.

WILLIAM of *Auxerre*, who acquired a considerable reputation by his *Theological System* [n];

PETER of *Blois* [o], whose epistles and other productions may yet be read with profit;

JOHN of *Salisbury*, a man of great learning and true genius, whose philosophical and theological knowledge was adorned with a lively wit and a flowing eloquence, as appears in his *Metalogicus*, and his book *De nugis Curialium*;

PETRUS COMESTOR, author of *An Abridgment of the History of the Old and New Testament*, which was used in the schools for the instruction of the youth, and called probably from thence, *Historia Scholastica*.

A more ample account of the names and characters of the Latin writers may be found in those authors, who have professedly treated that branch of literature.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church in this century.

Christianity
corrupted
more and
more.

I. **W**HEN we consider the multitude of causes which united their influence in obscuring the lustre of genuine Christianity, and corrupting it by a profane mixture of the inventions of superstitious and designing men, with its pure and sublime doctrines, it will appear surprizing, that the religion of Jesus was not totally extinguished. All orders contributed, though in different ways, to corrupt the native purity of true religion. The Roman pontiffs led the way; they would not suffer any doctrines that had the smallest tendency to diminish their despotic authority; but obliged the public teachers to interpret the precepts of Christianity in such a manner, as to render them subservient to the

[n] LE BOEUF, *Dissertation sur la Somme Theologique de Guillaume d'Auxerre* in MOLAT's *Continuation des Memoires d'Histoire et de Litterature*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 317.

[o] PETRUS, *Blesensis*.

support of papal dominion and tyranny. This order was so much the more terrible, in that such as refused to comply with it, and to force the words of scripture into significations totally opposite to the intention of its divine author, such, in a word, as had the courage to place the authority of the gospel above that of the Roman pontiffs, and to consider it as the supreme rule of their conduct, were answered with the formidable arguments of fire and sword, and received death in the most cruel forms, as the fruit of their sincerity and resolution. The priests and monks contributed, in their way, to disfigure the beautiful simplicity of religion; and, finding it their interest to keep the people in the grossest ignorance and darkness, dazzled their feeble eyes with the ludicrous pomp of a gaudy worship, and led them to place the whole of religion in vain ceremonies, bodily austerities, and exercises, and, particularly, in a blind and stupid veneration for the clergy. The scholastic doctors, who considered the decisions of the ancients and the precepts of the Dialecticians, as the great rule and criterion of truth, instead of explaining the doctrines of the gospel, mined them by degrees, and sunk divine truth under the ruins of a captious philosophy; while the Mystics, running into the opposite extreme, maintained, that the souls of the truly pious were incapable of any spontaneous motions, and could only be moved by a *divine impulse*; and thus not only set limits to the pretensions of reason, but excluded it entirely from religion and morality; nay, in some measure, denied its very existence.

II. The consequences of all this were superstition and ignorance, which were substituted in the place of true religion, and reigned over the multitude with an universal sway. Relics, which were for the most part fictitious, or at least uncertain, attracted more powerfully the confidence of the people, than the merits of CHRIST, and were supposed by many to be more effectual, than the prayers offered to heaven through the mediation and

Superstition
reigns a-
mong the
multitude

CENT.
XII.

intercession of that divine redeemer [p]. The opulent, whose circumstances enabled them either to erect new temples, or to repair and embellish the old, were looked upon as the happiest of all mortals, and were considered as the most intimate friends of the most high. While they, whom poverty rendered incapable of such pompous acts of liberality, contributed to the multiplication of religious edifices by their bodily labours, chearfully performed the services that beasts of burden are usually employed in, such as carrying stones and drawing waggons, and expected to obtain eternal salvation by these voluntary and painful efforts of misguided zeal [q]. The saints had a greater number of worshippers, than the supreme Being and the Saviour of mankind; nor did these superstitious worshippers trouble their heads about that knotty question, which occasioned much debate and many laborious disquisitions in succeeding times, viz. *How the inhabitants of heaven came to the knowledge of the prayers and supplications that were addressed to them from the earth?* This question was prevented in this century by an opinion, which the Christians had received from their Pagan ancestors, that the inhabitants of heaven descended often from above, and frequented the places, in which they had formerly taken pleasure during their residence upon earth [r]. To finish the horrid portrait of superstition, we shall only observe, that the stupid credulity of the people in this cen-

[p] See GUIBERT DE NOVIGENTO, *De pignoribus* (so were relics called) *sanctorum*, in his *Works* published by DACHERIUS, p. 327. where he attacks, with judgment and dexterity, these superstition of the miserable times.

[q] See HAYMON's Treatise concerning this custom, published by MABILLON, at the end of the sixth tome of his *Annal. Benedict.* See also these *Annals*, p. 392.

[r] As a proof that this assertion is not without foundation, we shall transcribe the following remarkable passage of the *Life of St. ALTMAN*, bishop of Padua, as it stands in SEB. TENGNAGL's *Collect. Vet. Monumentor.* p. 41. *Vos licet, sancti Domini, somno vestro requiescat. . . haud tamen crediderim, spiritus vestros deesse locis, quæ viventes tanta devotione construxistis et dilexistis. Credo vos adesse cunctis illic degentibus, astare videlicet orantibus, succurrere laborantibus et vota singulorum in conspectu divinæ majestatis promoveri.*

ture

tury went so far, that when any person, either through CENT. XII.
the frenzy of a disordered imagination, or with a design
to deceive, published the dreams or visions, which they
fancied, or *pretended*, they had from above, the multi-
tude resorted to the new oracle, and respected its deci-
sions as the commands of God, who, in this way, was
pleased, as they imagined, to communicate council,
instruction, and the knowledge of his will to men. This
appears, to mention no other examples, from the ex-
traordinary reputation, which the two famous prophet-
esses, HILDEGARD abbess of *Bingen*, and ELIZABETH
of *Schonauge*, obtained in *Germany* [s].

III. This universal reign of ignorance and superstition
was dexterously, yet basely, improved by the rulers of
the church to fill their coffers, and to drain the purses
of the deluded multitude. And, indeed, all the vari-
ous ranks and orders of the clergy, had, each, their
peculiar method of fleecing the people. The *bishops*,
when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or
for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock
the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties
imposed upon transgressors by a sum of money, which
was to be applied to certain religious purposes; or, in
other words, they published *indulgences*, which became
an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal or-
ders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and
execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement
of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred
edifices, which augmented considerably the external
pomp and splendor of the church [t]. The *abbots* and
monks, who were not qualified to grant *indulgences*, had
recourse to other methods of enriching their convents.
They carried about the country the carcases and relics
of the saints in solemn procession, and permitted the
multitude to behold, touch, and embrace these sacred
and lucrative remains, at certain fixed prices. The mo-

The scandalous traffic of
indulgences
began by the
bishops.

[s] See MABILLON, *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 431. 529. 554.

[t] STEPHANUS Obazinensis in BALUZII *Miscellan.* tom. iv. p. 130.

—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 535, &c.

CENT.
XII.

And afterwards monopolized by the Roman pontiffs.

nastic orders gained often as much by this raree show, as the bishops did by their indulgences [u].

IV. When the Roman pontiffs cast an eye upon the immense treasures, that the inferior rulers of the church were accumulating by the sale of *indulgences*, they thought proper to limit the power of the bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon transgressors, and assumed, almost entirely, this profitable traffic to themselves. In consequence of this new measure, the court of *Rome* became the general magazine of indulgences; and the pontiffs, when either the wants of the church, the emptiness of their coffers, or the demon of avarice prompted them to look out for new subsidies, published, not only an universal, but also a complete, or what they called a *plenary* remission of all the *temporal* pains and penalties, which the church had annexed to certain transgressions. They went still farther; and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish, even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step this, which the bishops, with all their avarice and presumption, had never once ventured to take [w].

The pontiffs first employed this pretended prerogative in promoting the holy war, and shed abroad their *indulgences*, though with a certain degree of moderati-

[u] We find in the records of this century innumerable examples of this method of extorting contributions from the multitude. See the *Chronicon Centulense* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 345.—*Vita Stæ Romanæ*, *ibid.* p. 137.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 342. 644.—*Acta Sanctor. Mensis Maii*, tom. vii. p. 533. where we have an account of a long journey made by the relics of *St. Marculus*.—MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 519, 520. & tom. ii. p. 732.

[w] MORINUS, *De administratione sacramenti pœnitentiæ*, lib. x. cap. xx, xxi, xxii. p. 768.—RICH. SIMON, *Biblioth. Critique*, tom. iii. cap. xxxiii. p. 371.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Sæc. v. Actor. Sanctor. Benedic.* p. 54. not to speak of the protestant writers, whom I designedly pass over,

on, in order to encourage the European princes to form new expeditions for the conquest of *Palestine*; but in process of time, the charm of indulgences was practised upon various occasions of much less consequence, and merely with a view to filthy lucre [x]. Their introduction, among other things, destroyed the credit and authority of the ancient *canonical* and *ecclesiastical discipline of penance*, and occasioned the removal and suppression of the *penitentials* [y], by which the reins were let loose to every kind of vice. Such proceedings stood much in need of a plausible defence, but this was impossible. To justify therefore these scandalous measures of the pontiffs, a most monstrous and absurd doctrine was now invented, which was modified and embellished by St. THOMAS in the following century, and which contained among others the following enormities:

“ That there actually existed an immense treasure of
 “ *merit* composed of the pious deeds, and virtuous actions which the saints had performed *beyond what was*
 “ *necessary* for their own salvation [z], and which were
 “ therefore applicable to the benefit of others; that the
 “ guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was
 “ the Roman pontiff; and that, of consequence, he
 “ was empowered to *assign* to such as he thought proper, a *portion* of this inexhaustible source of *merit*,
 “ suitable to their respective *guilt*, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes.”
 It is a most deplorable mark of the power of superstition, that a doctrine, so absurd in its nature, and so pernicious in its effects, should yet be retained and defended in the church of *Rome* [a].

V. Nothing

[x] MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 761.—FRANC. PAGI. *Breviar. Rom. Pontif.* tom. ii. p. 60.—THEOD. RUINARTI *Vita Urbani II*, p. 231. tom. iii. Opp. Posthum.

[(y) The *Penitential* was a book, in which the degree and kind of penance that were annexed to each crime, were registered.]

[(z) These works are known by the name of *Works of Supererogation*.]

[(a) For a satisfactory and ample account of the enormous doctrine of indulgences, see a very learned and judicious work, entitled, *Lettres sur*

CENT.
XII.

The expositors and commentators of this century.

V. Nothing was more common in this century than expositors and interpreters of the sacred writings, but nothing was so rare, as to find, in that class of authors, the qualifications that are essentially required in a good commentator. Few of these expositors were attentive to search after the true signification of the words employed by the sacred writers, or to investigate the precise sense in which they were used; and these few were destitute of the succours which such researches demand. The Greek and Latin commentators, blinded by their enthusiastic love of antiquity, and their implicit veneration for the doctors of the early ages of the church, drew from their writings, without discernment or choice, a heap of passages, which they were pleased to consider as illustrations of the holy scriptures. Such were the commentaries of EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, an eminent expositor among the Greeks, upon the *Psalms*, *Gospels*, and *Epistles*; though it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that this writer follows, in some places, the dictates of his own judgment, and gives, upon certain occasions, proofs of penetration and genius. Among the Latins, we might give several examples of the injudicious manner of expounding the divine word that prevailed in this century, such as the *Lucubrations* of PETER LOMBARD, GILBERT DE LA PORÉE, and the famous ABELARD, upon the *Psalms* of DAVID, and the *Epistles* of St. PAUL. Nor do those commentators among the Latins, who expounded the whole of the sacred writings, and who are placed at the head of the expositors of this age, such as GILBERT, bishop of *London*, surnamed the *Universal*, on account of the vast extent

sur les Jubilés, published in the year 1751, in three volumes 8vo. by the Reverend Mr. CHAIS, minister of the French church in the *Hague*, on occasion of the universal *Jubilée* celebrated at *Rome* the preceding year, by the order of BENEDICT XIV. In the 2d volume of this excellent work, which we shall have frequent occasion to consult in the course of this history, there is a clear account, and a satisfactory refutation of the doctrine in question, as also the history of that monstrous practice from its origin to the present times.]

of his erudition [b], and HERVEY, a most studious Benedictine monk [c], deserve a higher place in our esteem, than the authors already mentioned. The writers that merit the preference among the Latins are RUPERT of *Duytz*, and ANSELM of *Laon*; the former of whom expounded several books of scripture, and the latter composed, or rather compiled, a *glossary upon the sacred writings*. As to those doctors who were not carried away by an enthusiastical veneration for the ancients, who had courage enough to try their own talents, and to follow the dictates of their own sagacity, they were chargeable with defects of another kind; for, disregarding and overlooking the beautiful simplicity of divine truth, they were perpetually bent on the search of all sorts of mysteries in the sacred writings, and were constantly on the scent after some hidden meaning in the plainest expressions of scripture. The people, called *Mystics*, excelled peculiarly in this manner of expounding, and forced, by their violent explications, the word of God into a conformity with their visionary doctrines, their enthusiastic feelings, and the system of discipline which they had drawn from the excursions of their irregular fancies. Nor were the commentators, who pretended to logic and philosophy, and who, in effect, had applied themselves to these profound sciences, free from the contagion of *mysticism* in their explications of scripture. They followed, on the contrary, the example of these fanatics, as may be seen by HUGH of St. VICTOR's *Allegorical Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, by the *Mystical Ark* of RICHARD of St. VICTOR, and by the *Mystical Commentaries* of GUIBERT, abbot of *Nogent*, on *Obadiab*, *Hosea*, and *Amos* [d]; not to mention several other writers who seem to have been animated by the same spirit.

[b] For an account of this prelate, see LE BOEF *Memoires concernant l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 486.

[c] An ample account of this learned Benedictine is to be found in GABR. LIRON *Singularite. Historiques et Litteraires*, tom. iii. p. 29.— See also MABILLON *Annales Bened.* tom. vi. p. 477. 719.

[d] The *Prologus in Abdiam* has been published by MABILLON, in his *Annales Bened.* tom. vi. p. 637.

CENT.
XII.

The manner
of teaching
theology that
now prevail-
ed.

VI. The most eminent teachers of theology resided at *Paris*, which city was, from this time forward, frequented by students of divinity from all parts of *Europe*, who resorted thither in crouds, to receive instruction from these celebrated masters. The French divines were divided into different sects. The first of these sects, who were distinguished by the title of *The Ancient Theologists*, explained the doctrines of religion, in a plain and simple manner, by passages drawn from the holy scriptures, from the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors, and very rarely made use of the succours of reason or philosophy, in their theological lectures. In this class we place **St. BERNARD**, **PETER**, surnamed the *Chanter*, **WALTER** of **St. VICTOR**, and other doctors, who declared an open and bitter war against the *philosophical divines*. The doctors, which were afterwards known by the name of *Positivi* and *Sententiarii*, were not, in all respects, different from these now mentioned. Imitating the examples of **ANSELM**, archbishop of *Canterbury*, **LANFRANC**, **HILDEBERT**, and other doctors of the preceding century, they taught and confirmed their system of theology, principally, by collecting the decisions of the inspired writers, and the opinions of the ancients. At the same time, they were far from rejecting the succours of reason, and the discussions of philosophy, to which they more especially had recourse, when difficulties were to be solved, and adversaries to be refuted, but in the application of which all did not discover the same degree of moderation and prudence. **HUGH** of **St. VICTOR** is supposed to have been the first writer of this century, who taught in this manner the doctrines of Christianity digested into a regular system. His example, however, was followed by many; but none acquired such a shining reputation by his labours in this branch of sacred erudition, as **PETER**, bishop of *Paris*, surnamed **LOMBARD**, from the country which gave him birth. The *Four Books of Sentences* of this eminent prelate, which appeared in the year 1172 [e], were not only received

[e] **ERPOLDI LINDENBROGII** *Scriptores Septentrionales*. p. 250.

with

with universal applause, but acquired also such a high degree of authority, as induced the most learned doctors in all places to employ their labours in illustrating and expounding them. Scarcely was there any divine of note that did not undertake this popular task except HENRY of Gendt, and a few others [f]; so that LOMBARD, who was commonly called *Master of the sentences*, on account of the famous work now mentioned, became truly a classic author in divinity [g].

CENT.
XII.

VII. The followers of LOMBARD, who were called *Sententiarii*, though their manner of teaching was defective in some respects, and not altogether exempt from vain and trivial questions, were always attentive to avoid entering too far into the subtilties of the Dialecticians, nor did they presumptuously attempt submitting the divine truths of the gospel to the uncertain and obscure principles of a refined and intricate logic, which was rather founded on the excursions of fancy, than on the nature of things. They had, for contemporaries, another set of theologists, who were far from imitating their moderation and prudence in this respect; a set of subtle doctors who taught the plain and simple truths of Christianity in the obscure terms and with the perplexing distinctions used by the Dialecticians, and ex-

The scholastics, properly so called.

[f] A list of the commentators who laboured in explaining the *Sentences* of PETER LOMBARD, is given by ANTON. POSSEVINUS, in his *Biblioth. Selecta*, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. xiv. p. 242.

[(g)] The *Book of Sentences*, which rendered the name of PETER LOMBARD so illustrious, was a compilation of sentences and passages drawn from the fathers, whose manifold contradictions this eminent prelate endeavoured to reconcile. His work may be considered as a complete body of divinity. It consists of FOUR BOOKS, each of which is subdivided into various chapters and sections. In the FIRST he treats of the *Trinity*, and the *Divine Attributes*; in the SECOND, of the *Creation* in general, of the *Origin of Angels*, the *Formation and Fall of Man*, of *Grace* and *Free Will*, of *Original Sin* and *Actual Transgression*; in the THIRD, of the *Incarnation*, and *Perfections of Jesus Christ*, of *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, of the *Gifts of the Spirit*, and the *Commandments of God*. The *Sacraments*, the *Resurrection*, the *Last Judgment*, and the *State of the Righteous in Heaven*, are the subjects treated in the FOURTH and last book of this famous work, which was the wonder of the twelfth century, and is little more than an object of contempt in ours.]

plained,

CENT.
XII.

plained, or rather darkened, with their unintelligible jargon, the sublime precepts of the wisdom that is from above. This method of teaching theology, which was afterwards called the *scholastic* system, because it was in general use in the schools, had for its author PETER ABELARD, a man of the most subtile genius, whose public lectures in philosophy and divinity had raised him to the highest summit of literary renown, and who was successively canon of *Paris*, and monk and abbot of *Ruys* [b]. The fame he acquired by this new method, engaged many ambitious divines to adopt it; and, in a short space of time, the followers of ABELARD multiplied prodigiously not only in *France*, but also in *England* and *Italy*. Thus was the pure and peaceable wisdom of the gospel perverted into a science of mere sophistry and chicane; for these subtile doctors never explained or illustrated any subject, but, on the contrary, darkened and disfigured the plainest expressions, and the most evident truths by their laboured and useless distinctions, fatigued both themselves and others with unintelligible solutions of abstruse and frivolous questions, and, through a rage for disputing, maintained with equal vehemence and ardour the opposite sides of the most serious and momentous questions [i].

The Christian doctors divided into two classes, called *biblici* and *scholastici*.

VIII. From this period, therefore, an important distinction was made between the Christian doctors, who were divided into two classes. In the first class were placed those, who were called by the various names of *biblici*, i. e. bible-doctors, *dogmatici* and *positivi*, i. e. didactic divines, and also *veteres* or ancients; and in the second were ranged the *scholastics*, who were also distinguished by the titles of *Sententiarii*, after the *Master of the sentences*, and *Novi*, to express their recent

[b] ABELARD acknowledges this himself, *Epist. i. cap. ix. p. 20. Oper.*—See also LAUNOIUS, *De Scholis Caroli M. p. 67. cap. lix. tom. iv. Opp. part. I.*

[i] CÆS. EGASSE DE BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 201. 583.*—ANTON. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 58.*—LAUNOIUS, *De varia Aristotelis fortuna in Acad. Paris. cap. iii. p. 187. Edit. Elfwickii Vitemb. 1720. in 8vo.*

origin. The *former* expounded, though in a wretched manner, the sacred writings in their public schools, illustrated the doctrines of Christianity without deriving any succours from reason or philosophy, and confirmed their opinions by the united testimonies of *Scripture* and *Tradition*. The *latter* expounded, instead of the Bible, the famous *Book of Sentences*, reduced, under the province of their subtle philosophy, whatever the gospel proposed as an object of faith, or a rule of practice, and perplexed and obscured its divine doctrines and precepts by a multitude of vain questions, and idle speculations [k]. The method of the *scholastics* exhibited a pompous aspect of learning, and these subtle doctors seemed to surpass their adversaries in sagacity and genius; hence they excited the admiration of the studious youth, who flocked to their schools in multitudes, while the *biblici*, or *doctors of the sacred page*, as they were also called, had the mortification to see their auditories unfrequented, and almost totally deserted [l]. The scholastic theology continued in high repute in all the European colleges until the time of LUTHER.

IX. It must, however, be observed, that these metaphysical divines had many difficulties to encounter, and

The scholastic divines opposed from different quarters.

[k] See BOVLAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. iii. p. 657.

[l] The *Book of Sentences* seemed to be at this time in much greater repute, than the holy scriptures, and the compilations of PETER LOMBARD were preferred to the doctrines and precepts of JESUS CHRIST. This appears evident from the following remarkable passage in ROGER BACON's *Op. Maj. ad Clementem IV*, *Pontif. Rom.* published in 1733 at London, by SAM. JEBB, from the original MSS. *Baccalaureus qui legit textum (scripturæ) succumbit lectori sententiarum et ubique in omnibus honoratur et præfertur: nam ille, qui legit sententias, habet principalem horam legendi secundum suam voluntatem, habet et socium et cameram apud religiosos: sed qui legit Bibliam, caret his, et mendicat horam legendi secundum quod placet lectori sententiarum: et qui legit summas, disputat ubique et pro magistro habetur, reliquis qui textum legit non potest disputare, sicut fuit hoc anno Bononiæ, et in multis aliis locis, quod est absurdum: manifestum est igitur, quod textus illius facultatis (sc. Theologicæ) subijcitur uni summæ magistrali.* Such was now the authority of the scholastic theology, as appear from the words of BACON, who lived in the following age, and in whose writings there are many things highly worthy of the attention of the curious.

CENT.
XII.

much opposition to overcome, before they could obtain that boundless authority in the European schools which they enjoyed so long. They were attacked from different quarters; on the one hand, by the *ancient divines*, or bible-doctors; on the other, by the *mystics*, who considered true wisdom and knowledge as unattainable by study or reasoning, and as the fruit of mere contemplation, inward feeling, and a passive acquiescence in divine influences. Thus that ancient conflict between *faith* and *reason*, that had formerly divided the Latin doctors, and had been for many years hushed in silence, was now unhappily revived, and produced every where tumults and dissensions. The patrons and defenders of the ancient theology, who attacked the schoolmen, were GUIBERT abbot of *Nogent* [m], PETER abbot of *Moustier-la-Celle* [n], PETER the Chanter [o], and principally WALTER of St. VICTOR [p]. The mystics also sent forth into the field of controversy upon this occasion their ablest and most violent champions, such as JOACHIM abbot of *Flori*, RICHARD of St. VICTOR, who loaded with invectives the scholastic divines, and more especially LOMBARD, though he was, undoubtedly, the most candid and modest doctor of that subtle tribe. These dissensions and contests, whose deplorable effects augmented from day to day, engaged ALEXANDER III, who was pontiff at this time, to interpose his authority in order to restore tranquillity and concord in the church. For this purpose he convoked a solemn and numerous assembly of the clergy in the year 1164 [q], in which the licentious rage of disputing about re-

[m] In his *Tropologia in Oseam*, p. 203. Opp.

[n] *Opuscul.* p. 277. 396. edit. *Benedict.*

[o] In his *Verbum Abbreviat.* cap. iii. p. 6, 7. published at *Mons* in the year 1639, in 4to. by GEORGE GALOPIN.

[p] In his *Libri iv. contra Quatuor Franciæ Labyrinthos et novos hæreticos*. He called *Abelard*, *Gilbert de la Porree*, *Lombard*, and *Peter of Poitiers*, who were the principal scholastic divines of this century, the four *Labyrinths* of France. For an account of this work, which is yet in manuscript, see BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 619. 659.

[q] ANT. PAGI *Critic. in Baronium*, tom. iv. ad A. 1164. p. 614. 615.

ligious matters was condemned, and another in the year 1179, in which some particular errors of PETER LOMBARD were pointed out and censured [r].

CENT.
XII.

X. But of all the adversaries that assailed the scholastic divines in this century, none was so formidable as the famous St. BERNARD, whose zeal was ardent beyond all expression, and whose influence and authority were equal to his zeal. And, accordingly, we find this illustrious abbot combating the Dialecticians, not only in his writings and his conversation, but also by his deeds; arming against them synods and councils, the decrees of the church, and the laws of the state. The renowned ABELARD, who was as much superior to St. BERNARD in sagacity and erudition, as he was his inferior in credit and authority, was one of the first, who felt, by a bitter experience, the aversion of the lordly abbot to the scholastic doctors. For in the year 1121, he was called before the council of *Soissons*, and before that of *Sens* in the year 1140, in both of which assemblies he was accused by St. BERNARD of the most pernicious errors, and was finally condemned, as an egregious heretic [s]. The charge brought against this subtile and learned monk was, that he had notoriously corrupted the doctrine of the Trinity, blasphemed against the majesty of the Holy Ghost, entertained unworthy and false conceptions of the person and offices of CHRIST, and the union of the two natures in him, denied the necessity of the divine grace to render us virtuous, and, in a word, that his doctrines struck at the fundamental principles of all religion. It must be confessed by those, who are acquainted with the writings of ABELARD, that he expressed himself in a very singular and incongruous manner upon several points of theology [t];

And principally by St. Bernard.

and

[r] MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major*, p. 115.—BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris*, tom. ii. p. 402.

[s] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article ABELARD.—GERVAIS, *Vie d'Abelard et d'Heloise*—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 63. 84. 324. 395.—MARTENE, *Thesaur. Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 1139.

[(t)] He affirmed, for example, among other things equally unintelligible and extravagant, that the names *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*,

CENT. XII. and this indeed is one of the inconveniences to which subtle refinements upon mysterious doctrines frequently lead. But it is certain, on the other hand, that St. BERNARD, who had much more genius than logic, misunderstood some of the opinions of ABELARD, and wilfully perverted others. For the zeal of this good abbot too rarely permitted him to consult in his decisions the dictates of impartial equity; and hence it was, that he almost always applauded beyond measure, and censured without mercy [u].

XI. ABELARD was not the only scholastic divine, who paid dear for his metaphysical refinement upon the doctrines of the gospel, and whose logic exposed him to the unrelenting fury of persecution. GILBERT DE LA PORRE, bishop of *Poitiers*, who had taught theology and philosophy at *Paris*, and in other places with the highest applause, met with the same fate. Unfortunately for him, ARNOLD and CALO, two of his archdeacons, who had been educated in the principles of the ancient theology, heard him one day disputing, with more subtilty than was meet, concerning the divine nature. Alarmed at the novelty of his doctrine, they brought a charge of blasphemy against him before pope EUGENIUS III, who was, at that time, in *France*; and to give weight to their accusation, they gained over St. BERNARD, and engaged him in their cause. The zea-

were improper terms, and were only used to express the fullness of the sovereign good; that the Father was the plenitude of power, the Son a certain power, and the Holy Ghost no power at all; that the Holy Ghost was the soul of the world, with other crude fancies of a like nature, mingled, however, with bold truths.]

[u] See GERVAIS, *Vie d'Abelard*, tom. ii. p. 162.—LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Ancienne et Moderne*, tom. ix. p. 352.—DIONYS. PETAV. *Dogmata Theolog.* tom. i. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 217. as also the works of BERNARD, *passim*. ABELARD, who, notwithstanding all his crude notions, was a man of true genius, was, undoubtedly, worthy of a better fate, than that which fell to his lot, and of a more enlightened age, than that in which he lived. After passing through the furnace of persecution, and having suffered afflictions of various kinds, of which he has transmitted the history to posterity, he retired to the monastery of *Clugni*, where he ended his days in the year 1142.

lous

lous abbot treated the matter with his usual vehemence, and opposed GILBERT with the utmost severity and bitterness, first in the council of *Paris*, A. D. 1147, and afterwards in that which was assembled at *Rheims* the year following. In this latter council the accused bishop, in order to put an end to the dispute, offered to submit his opinions to the judgment of the assembly, and of the Roman pontiff, by whom they were condemned. The errors attributed to GILBERT were the fruits of an excessive subtilty, and of an extravagant passion for reducing the doctrines of Christianity under the empire of metaphysic and dialectic. He distinguished the divine *essence* from the *Deity*, the *properties* of the three divine persons from the *persons* themselves, not in reality, but, by abstraction, in *statu rationis*, as the metaphysicians speak; and, in consequence of these distinctions, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature. To these he added other opinions, derived from the same source, which were rather vain, fanciful, and adapted to excite surprize by their novelty, than glaringly false, or really pernicious. These refined notions were far above the comprehension of good St. BERNARD, who was, by no means, accustomed to such profound disquisitions, to such intricate researches [w].

CENT.
XII.The state of
moral and
practical
theology.

XII. The important science of morals was not now in a very flourishing state, as may be easily imagined when we consider the genius and spirit of that philosophy, which, in this century, reduced all the other sciences under its dominion, and of which we have given some account in the preceding sections. The only moral writer among the Greeks, who is worthy of mention, is PHILIP, surnamed the *Solitary*, whose book entitled *Dioptra*, which consists in a dialogue between the body and the soul, is composed with judgment and elegance, and contains many things proper to nourish pious and virtuous sentiments.

[w] See DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. ii. p. 223. 232.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 343. 415. 433.—*Gallia Christiana Benedic.* tom. ii. p. 1175.—MATTH. PARIS *Histor. Major*, p. 56.—PETAVII *Dogmata Theologica*, tom. i. lib. i. cap. viii.—LONGUEVAL *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. ix. p. 147.

CENT.
XII.

The Latin Moralists of this age may be divided into two classes, *scholastics*, and *mystics*. The former discoursed about virtue, as they did about truth, in the most unfeeling, unaffecting jargon, and generally subjoined their arid system of morals to what they called their *didactic theology*. The latter treated the duties of morality in a quite different manner; their language was tender, persuasive, and affecting, and their sentiments often beautiful and sublime; but they taught in a confused and irregular manner, without method, or precision, and frequently mixed the dross of Platonism with the pure treasures of celestial truth.

We might also place in the class of moral writers the greatest part of the commentators and expositors of this century, who, laying aside all attention to the signification of the words used by the sacred writers, and scarcely ever attempting to illustrate the truths they reveal, or the events which they relate, turned, by forced and allegorical explications, every passage of scripture to practical uses, and drew lessons of morality from every quarter. We could produce many instances of this way of commenting besides GUIBERT'S *Moralia*, in *Jobum*, *Amos* et *Lamentationes Jeremie*.

Polemic
writers.

XIII. Both Greeks and Latins were seized with that enthusiastic passion for dialectical researches, that raged in this century, and were thereby rendered extremely fond of captious questions and theological contests, while at the same time, the love of this controversy seduced them from the paths that lead to truth, and involved them in labyrinths of uncertainty and error. The discovery of truth was not, indeed, the great object they had in view; their principal design was to puzzle and embarrass their adversaries, and overwhelm them with an enormous heap of fine-spun distinctions, an impetuous torrent of words without meaning, a long list of formidable authorities, and a specious train of fallacious consequences embellished with railings, and invectives. The principal polemic writers among the Greeks were CONSTANTINUS HARMENOPULUS, and

Eu-

EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS. The former published a short CENT. XII. treatise *De Sectis Hæreticorum*, i. e. concerning the *Hæretical Sects*. The latter in a long and laboured work, entitled *Panoplia*, attacked all the various heresies and errors that troubled the church; but, not to mention the extreme levity and credulity of this writer, his manner of disputing was highly defective, and all his arguments, according to the wretched method that now prevailed, were drawn from the writings of the ancient doctors, whose authority supplied the place of evidence. Both these authors were sharply censured in a satirical poem composed by ZONARAS. The Latin writers were also employed in various branches of religious controversy. HONORIUS of *Autun* wrote against certain heresies; and ABELARD combated them all. The Jews, whose credit was now entirely sunk, and whose circumstances were miserable in every respect, were refuted by GILBERT *de Castilione*, ODO, PETRUS ALFONSUS, RUPERT of *Duitz*, PETRUS MAURITIUS, RICHARDUS *à Sto. Victore*, and PETRUS BLESENSIS, according to the logic of the times, and EUTHYMIUS, with several other divines, directed their polemic force against the Saracens.

XIV. The contest between the Greeks and Latins, the subject of which has been already mentioned, was still carried on by both parties with the greatest obstinacy and vehemence. The Grecian champions were EUTHYMIUS, NICETAS, and others of less renown, while the cause of the Latins was vigorously maintained by ANSELM, bishop of *Havelberg*, and HUGO ETHERIANUS, who distinguished themselves eminently by their erudition in this famous controversy [x]. Many attempts were made, both at *Rome* and at *Constantinople*, to reconcile these differences, and to heal these fatal divisions; and this union was solicited, in a particular manner, by the emperors in the Comnene family, who expected to draw much advantage from the

The contest
between the
Greeks and
Latins con-
tinued.

[x] See LEO ALLATIUS *De perpetua consensione Ecclesiæ Oriental. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 644.

CENT.
XII.

friendship and alliance of the Latins, towards the support of the Grecian empire, which was at this time in a declining, nay, almost in a desperate condition. But as the Latins aimed at nothing less than a despotic supremacy over the Greek church, and as, on the other hand, the Grecian bishops could, by no means, be induced to yield an implicit obedience to the Roman pontiff, or to condemn the measures and proceedings of their ancestors, the negotiations, undertaken for the restoration of peace, widened the breach instead of healing it, and the terms proposed on both sides, but especially by the Latins, exasperated, instead of calming, the resentments, and animosities of the contending parties.

Matters of
less moment
controverted
among the
Greeks.

XV. Many controversies of inferior moment were carried on among the Greeks, who were extremely fond of disputing, and were scarcely ever without debates upon religious matters. We shall not enter into a circumstantial narration of these theological contests, which are more proper to fatigue than to amuse or instruct, but shall confine ourselves to a brief mention of those which made the greatest noise in the empire. Under the reign of EMANUEL COMNENUS, whose extensive learning was accompanied with an excessive curiosity, several theological controversies were carried on, in which he himself bore a principal part, and which fomented such discords and animosities among a people already exhausted and dejected by intestine tumults, as threatened their destruction. The first question that exercised the metaphysical talent of this over curious emperor and his subtle doctors was this: *In what sense it was or might be affirmed, that an incarnate God was at the same time the OFFERER and the OBLATION?* When this knotty question had been long debated, and the emperor had maintained, for a considerable time, the solution of it that was contrary to the opinion generally received, he yielded at length, and embraced the popular notion of that unintelligible subject. The consequence of this step was, that many men of eminent abilities and great credit, who had differed from the doctrine

doctrine of the church upon this article, were deprived of their honours and employments [y]. What the emperor's opinion of this matter was, we find no where related in a satisfactory manner, and we are equally ignorant of the sentiments adopted by the church in relation to this question. It is highly probable that the emperor, followed by certain learned doctors, differed from the opinions generally received among the Greeks concerning the Lord's supper, and the *oblation* or sacrifice of CHRIST in that holy ordinance.

XVI. Some years after this a still more warm contest arose concerning the sense of those words of CHRIST, *John* xiv. 28. *For my Father is greater than I*, and divided the Greeks into the most bitter and deplorable factions. To the ancient explications of that important passage new illustrations were now added, and the emperor himself, who, from an indifferent prince, was become a wretched divine, published an exposition of that remarkable text, which he obtruded, as the only true sense of the words, upon a council assembled for that purpose, and was desirous of having received as a rule of faith by all the Grecian clergy. He maintained, that the words in question related to the *flesh that was bid in Christ, and that was passible, i. e.* subject to suffering [z], and not only ordered this decision to be engraven on tables of stone in the principal church of *Constantinople*, but also published an edict in which capital punishments were denounced against all such, as should presume to oppose this explication, or teach any doctrine repugnant to it [a]. This edict, however, expired with the emperor by whom it was issued out, and ANDRONICUS, upon his accession to the imperial throne, prohibited all those contests concerning speculative points of theology, that arose from an irregular and wanton curiosity, and suppressed, in a more particular manner, all inquiry into the subject now mentioned, by

The Greeks
dispute con-
cerning the
words of
Christ, *John*
xiv. 28.

[y] NICETAS CHONIATES, *Annal. Lib. vii. § 5. p. 112. ed. Velle.*

[z] Κατὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ κλίσιν καὶ παθητὴν σάρκα.

[a] NICETAS CHONIATES, *Annal. lib. vii. § 6. p. 113.*

enacting

C E N T.
XII.

Concerning
the God of
Mahomet.

enacting the severest penalties against such as should any way contribute to revive this dispute [b].

XVII. The same theological emperor troubled the church with another controversy concerning the God of MAHOMET. The Greek Catechisms pronounced *anathema* against the Deity worshipped by that false prophet, whom they represented as a *solid* and *spherical* Being [c]; for so they translated the Arabian word *elmed*, which is applied in the *koran* to the supreme Being, and which indeed is susceptible of that sense, though it also signifies *eternal* [d]. The emperor ordered the *anathema* to be effaced in the Catechism of the Greek church, on account of the high offence it gave to the Mahometans, who had either been already converted to Christianity, or were disposed to embrace that divine religion, and who were extremely shocked at such an insult offered to the name of God, with whatever restrictions and conditions it might be attended. The Christian doctors, on the other hand, opposed with much resolution and vehemence this imperial order. They observed that the *anathema*, pronounced in the Catechism, had no relation to the nature of God in general, nor to the true God in particular, and that, on the contrary, it was solely directed against the error of MAHOMET, against that phantom of a divinity which he had imagined. For that impostor pretended that the Deity could neither be *engendred* nor *engender*; whereas the Christians adore God the *Father*. After the bitterest disputes concerning this abstruse subject, and various efforts to reconcile the contending parties, the bishops, assembled in council, consented, though with the utmost difficulty, to transfer the *imprecation* of the Catechism from the God of MAHOMET, to MAHOMET himself, his doctrine and his sect [e].

The controversy concerning the Lord's supper is carried on among the Latins.

XVIII. The spirit of controversy raged among the Latins, as well as among the Greeks, and various

[b] NICETAS in *Andronico*, lib. ii. § 5. p. 175.

[c] Ὀλόσφυρος.

[d] RELAND, *De Religione Mohammedica*, lib. ii. § 3. p. 142.

[e] NICETÆ CHON. *Annales*, lib. vii. p. 113—116,

ments concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper CENT.
XII.
ere propagated, not only in the schools, but also in the writings of the learned. For though all the doctors of the church were now extremely desirous of being looked upon as enemies to the system of BERENGER, yet many of them, and, among others [f], RUPERT of Duytz, differed very little from the sentiments of that great man; at least, it is certain, that notwithstanding the famous controversy which had arisen in the church concerning the opinions of BERENGER, nothing was, as yet, precisely determined with respect to the manner of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist.

RUPERT had also religious contests of another nature with ANSELM, bishop of *Laon*, WILLIAM of *Champeaux*, and their disciples and followers, who maintained their doctrine, when they were no more. The *divine will* and the *divine omnipotence* were the subjects of this controversy, and the question debated was, "Whether God really willed, and actually produced all things that exist, or whether there are certain things whose existence he merely permits, and whose production instead of being the effects of his will, was contrary to it?" The affirmative of the latter part of this question was maintained by RUPERT, while his adversaries held that all things were the effects not only of the *divine power*, but also of the *divine will*. This learned abbot was also accused of having taught that the *angels were formed out of darkness*; that CHRIST *did not administer his body to JUDAS in the last supper*; and several other doctrines [g], contrary to the received opinions of the church.

XIX. These and other controversies of a more private kind, which made little noise in the world, were succeeded, about the year 1140, by one of a more public nature concerning, what was called, the *Immaculate con-*

As also that concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.

[f] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 30.

[g] See MENDOZ. *Epistola*, published by MARTENE, in his *Tresaur. Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 290.—JO. MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 19, 20. 42. 168. 261.

E N T. *ception of the Virgin MARY* [b]. Certain churches in
 XII. France began, about that time, to celebrate the festive

consecrated to this pretended *conception*, which the English had observed before this period in consequence of the exhortations of ANSELM, archbishop of *Canterbury*, as some authors report. The church of *Lions* was one of the first that adopted this new festival, which no sooner came to the knowledge of St. BERNARD, than he severely censured the Canons of *Lions* on account of this innovation, and opposed the *Immaculate conception of the Virgin* with the greatest vigour, as it supposed her being honoured with a privilege, which belonged to CHRIST alone. Upon this a warm contest arose; some siding with the Canons of *Lions*, and adopting the new festival, while others adhered to the sentiments of St. BERNARD. [i]. The controversy, however, notwithstanding the zeal of the contending parties, was carried on, during this century, with a certain degree of decency and moderation. But in after times, when the Dominicans were established in the academy of *Paris*, the contest was renewed with the greatest vehemence, and the same subject was debated, on both sides, with the utmost animosity and contention of mind. The Dominicans declared for St. BERNARD, while the academy patronized the canons of *Lions*, and adopted the new festival.

CH A P. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

Rites used
in the
Greek
church.

I. THE rites and ceremonies used in divine worship, both public and private, were now great-

[(b) The defenders of this *Immaculate Conception* maintained, that the Virgin MARY was conceived in the womb of her mother with the same purity that is attributed to CHRIST's conception in her womb.]

[i] STI. BERNARDI *Epistola* 174. tom. i. p. 170.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. ii. p. 135.—MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 327.—DOM. COLONIA, *Hist. Litt. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 233.

augmented among the Greeks, and the same superstitious passion for the introduction of new observances, discovered itself in all the eastern churches. The Gre-

CENT.
XH.

man, Nestorian, and Jacobite pontiffs, that were any way remarkable for their credit or ambition, were desirous of transmitting their names to posterity by the invention of some new rite, or by some striking change introduced into the method of worship that had hitherto prevailed. This was, indeed, almost the only way left to distinguish themselves in an age, where all sense of the excellence of genuine religion and substantial piety being almost totally lost, the whole care and attention of an ostentatious clergy, and a superstitious multitude were employed upon that round of external ceremonies and observances that were substituted in their place. Thus some attempted, though in vain, to render their names immortal by introducing a new method of reading or reciting the prayers of the church; others changed the church music; others, again, tortured their inventions to find out some new mark of veneration, that might be offered to the relics and images of the saints; while several ecclesiastics did not disdain to employ their time, with the most serious assiduity, in embellishing the garments of the clergy, and in forming the motions and postures, they were to observe, and the looks they were to assume in the celebration of divine worship.

II. We learn from the book *De divinis officiis*, composed by the famous RUPERT, or ROBERT, of Duytz, what were the rites in use among the Latins during this century, as also the reasons on which they were founded. According to the plan we follow, we cannot here enlarge upon the additions that were made to the doctrinal part of religion. We shall therefore only observe, that the enthusiastic veneration for the Virgin MARY, which had been hitherto carried to such an excessive height, increased now instead of diminishing, since her dignity was at this time considerably augmented by the new fiction or invention relating to her *immaculate conception*. For though, as we observed in the preceding chapter, St. BERNARD and others opposed

The Latin
ritual.

with

CENT.
XII.

with vigour this chimerical notion, yet their efforts were counteracted by the superstitious fury of the deluded multitude, whose judgment prevailed over the counsels of the wise. So that about the year 1138, there was a solemn festival instituted in honour of this pretended *conception*, though we know not, with any degree of certainty, by whose authority it was first established, nor in what place it was first celebrated [k].

CHAP. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

Fanatics of different kinds infest the Greek church.

I. **T**HE Greek and eastern churches were infested with fanatics of different kinds, who gave them much trouble, and engaged them in the most warm and violent contests. Certain of these fanatics professed to believe in a double trinity, rejected wedlock, abstained from flesh, treated, with the utmost contempt, the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, as also all the various branches of external worship, placed the essence of religion in internal prayer alone, and maintained, as it is said, that an evil being, or genius, dwelt in the breast of every mortal, and could be expelled from thence by no other method, than by perpetual supplications to the supreme Being. The founder of this enthusiastical sect is said to have been a person called LUCOPETRUS. His chief disciple was named TYCHICUS, who corrupted, by false and fanatical interpretations, several books of the sacred writings, and particularly the *Gospel according to St. Matthew* [l]. It is well known, that enthusiasts of this kind, who were rather wrong-headed than vicious, lived among the Greeks and Syrians, and more especially among the monks, for many ages before this period, and also in this century. The

[k] MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 327. 412.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 1198.

[l] See EUTHYMI *Triumphus de Secta Massalianorum* in JAC. TOLLII *Insignibus Itineris Italici*, p. 106—125.

accounts, indeed, that have been given of them, are not CENT.
XII.
in all respects to be depended upon; and there are several circumstances which render it extremely probable, that many persons of eminent piety, and zeal for genuine Christianity, were confounded by the Greeks among these enthusiasts, and ranked in the lists of heretics, merely on account of their opposing the vicious practices, and the insolent tyranny of the priesthood, and their treating with derision that motley spectacle of superstition that was supported by public authority. In Greece, and in all the eastern provinces, this sort of men were distinguished by the general and invidious appellation of *Massalians*, or *Euchites* [*m*], as the Latins comprehended all the adversaries of the Roman pontiff under the general terms of *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*. It is, however, necessary to observe, that the names above mentioned were very vague and ambiguous in the way they were applied by the Greeks and the Orientals, who made use of them to characterize, without distinction, all such as complained of the multitude of useless ceremonies, and of the vices of the clergy, without any regard to the difference, that there was between such persons in point of principles and morals. In short, the righteous and the profligate, the wise and the foolish, were equally comprehended under the name of *Massalians*, whenever they opposed the raging superstition of the times, or looked upon true and genuine piety as the essence of the Christian character.

[(*m*) *Massalians* and *Euchites* are denominations that signify the same thing, and denote, the one in the Hebrew, and the other in the Greek language, *persons that pray*. A sect, under this denomination, arose during the reign of the emperor CONSTANTIUS, about the year 361, founded by certain monks of *Mesopotamia*, who dedicated themselves wholly to prayer, and held many of the doctrines attributed by Dr. MOSHEIM to the *Massalians* of the XIIth century. See AUGUST. *De Hæres.* cap. lvii. and THEOD. *Hæret. Fab.* lib. iv. EPIPHANIUS speaks of another sort of *Massalians* still more ancient, who were mere Gentiles, acknowledged several gods, yet adored only one whom they called *Almighty*, and had oratories in which they assembled to pray and sing hymns. This resemblance between the *Massalians* and the *Essenes*, induced SCALIGER to think that EPIPHANIUS confounded the former with the latter.]

II. From

C. N. T.
XII.

The Bogomiles.

II. From the sect now mentioned, that of the *Bogomiles* is said to have proceeded, whose founder BASILIIUS, a monk by profession, was burnt at *Constantinople*, under the reign of ALEXIUS COMNENUS, after all attempts to make him renounce his errors had proved ineffectual. By the accounts we have of this unhappy man, and of the errors he taught, it appears sufficiently evident, that his doctrine resembled, in a striking manner, the religious system of the ancient Gnostics and Manichæans; though, at the same time, it is possible that the Greeks may have falsified his tenets in some respects. BASILIIUS maintained, that the world and all animal bodies were formed not by the Deity, but by an evil demon who had been cast down from heaven by the supreme Being; from whence he concluded, that the body was no more than the prison of the immortal spirit, and that it was, therefore, to be enervated by fasting, contemplation, and other exercises, that so the soul might be gradually restored to its primitive liberty; for this purpose also wedlock was to be avoided, with many other circumstances which we have often had occasion to explain and repeat in the course of this history. It was in consequence of the same principles, that this unfortunate enthusiast denied the *reality* of CHRIST's body, which, like the Gnostics and Manichæans, he considered only as a phantom, rejected the law of MOSES, and maintained that the body, upon its separation by death, returned to the malignant mass of matter, without either the prospect or possibility of a future resurrection to life and felicity. We have so many examples of fanatics of this kind in the records of ancient times, and also in the history of this century, that it is by no means to be wondered, that some one of them more enterprising than the rest should found a sect among the Greeks. The name of this sect was taken from the *divine mercy*, which its members are said to have incessantly implored; for the word *bogomilus*,

Chap

lus,

merc

II

those

prizi

grea

super

doler

of in

day

the c

perc

rable

the c

tive

good

bilit

der

both

gene

perf

was

min

few

atten

tion

avoi

were

and

an

vari

a nu

the

[n

Zon

Bogo

Diff

tom

mili

V

lus, in the Mysian language, signifies *calling out for* C E N T.
mercy from above [n]. XII.

III. The Latin sects were yet more numerous than those of the Greeks; and this will not appear at all surprising to such as consider the state of religion in the greatest part of the European provinces. The reign of superstition, the vices of the clergy, the luxury and indolence of the pontiffs and bishops, the encouragement of impiety by the traffic of *indulgences*, increasing from day to day, several pious, though weak men; who had the cause of CHRIST; and of his religion at heart, easily perceived that both were in a most declining and miserable state; and therefore attempted a reformation in the church, in order to restore Christianity to its primitive purity and lustre. But the knowledge of these good men was not equal to their zeal, nor were their abilities in any proportion to the grandeur of their undertakings. The greatest part of them were destitute both of learning and judgment, and, involved in the general ignorance of the times, undertook but very imperfectly the holy scriptures, from whence Christianity was derived, and by which the abuses that had been mingled with it could only be reformed. In a word, few of these well-meaning Christians were equal to an attempt so difficult and arduous as an universal reformation, and the consequence of this was, that, while they avoided the reigning abuses, they fell into others that were as little consistent with the genius of true religion; and carried the spirit of censure and reformation to such an excessive length, that it degenerated often into the various extravagancies of enthusiasm, and engendered a number of new sects, that became a new dishonour to the Christian cause.

The Latin
sects, and
the abuses
from
whence
they sprung.

[n] See ANNA COMNENA *Alexiados*, lib. xv. p. 384. edit. Venetæ.—ZONARAS *Annalium*, lib. xviii. p. 336.—JO. CHRIST. WOLF. *Historia Bogomilorum*, published at Witteburg, in 4to. 1712.—SAM. ANDRÆ *Diss. de Bogomilis* in JO. VOIGTII *Bibliotheca Historiæ Heresiologicæ*, tom. i. part. II. p. 121.—CHR. AUG. HEUMANNI *Dissertat de Bogomilis*.

CENT.

XII.

The Cathari.

IV. Among the sects that troubled the Latin church during this century the principal place is due to the *Catharists*, whom we have had already occasion to mention [o]. This numerous faction, leaving their first residence, which was in *Bulgaria*, spread themselves throughout almost all the European provinces, where they occasioned much tumult and disorder; but their fate was unhappy, for, wherever they were caught, they were put to death with the most unrelenting cruelty [p]. Their religion resembled the doctrine of the Manichæans and Gnostics, on which account they commonly received the denomination of the former, though they differed from the genuine and primitive Manichæans in many respects. They all indeed agreed in the following points of doctrine: *viz.* That matter was the source of all evil; that the creator of this world was a being distinct from the supreme Deity; that CHRIST was not cloathed with a real body, neither could be properly said to have been born, or to have seen death; that human bodies were the production of the evil principle; and that baptism and the Lord's supper were useless institutions, destitute of all efficacy and power. They exhorted all who embraced their doctrine to a rigorous abstinence from animal food, wine, and wedlock, and recommended to them in the most pathetic terms the most severe acts of austerity and mortification. They moreover treated with the utmost contempt all the books of the *Old Testament*, but expressed a high degree of veneration for the *New*, particularly for the *Four Gospels*; and, to pass over many other peculiarities in their doctrine, they maintained, that human souls endued with reason, were shut up by an unhappy fate in the dungeons of mortal bodies, from whence they could only be delivered by

[o] See CENT. III. PART. II. CH. V. § XVIII. but principally for that sort of *Catharists* here mentioned, see above CENT. XI. PART. II. CH. V. § II.

[p] See the accounts given of this unhappy and persecuted sect by CHARLES PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. i. in which, however, several circumstances are omitted.

fasting, mortification, and continence of every kind CENT.
XII.

[9].

V. These principles and tenets, though they were adopted and professed by the whole sect, yet were differently interpreted and modified by different doctors. Hence the *Catharists* were divided into various sects, which, however, on account of the general persecution in which they were all involved, treated each other with candour and forbearance, disputed with moderation, and were thus careful not to augment their common calamity by intestine feuds and animosities. Out of these different factions arose two leading and principal sects of the *Catharists*, which were distinguished from the rest by the number of their respective followers, and the importance of their differences. The one approached pretty nearly to the Manichæan system, held the doctrine of *two eternal Beings*, from whom all things were derived, the *God of light*, who was also the father of JESUS CHRIST, and the *principle of darkness*, whom they considered as the author of the material world. The other believed in *one eternal principle*, the FATHER of CHRIST, and the supreme God, by whom also they held that the *first matter* was created; but they added to this, that the *evil being*, after his rebellion against God and his fall from heaven, arranged this original matter according to his fancy, and divided it into four elements, in order to the production of this visible world. The former maintained, that CHRIST being clothed with a celestial body descended thus into the womb of the Virgin, and derived no part of his substance from her; while the latter taught, that he first assumed a real body in the womb of MARY, though not from her [r]. The sect, which held the doctrine of *two principles*,

The Catharists divided into two sects.

[9] Besides the writers which shall be mentioned presently, see the *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum*, published by MARTENE, in his *Thesaur. Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 1763. as also BONACURSI *Manifestatio Hæresis Catharorum* in LUC. DACHERII *Spicilegio*, tom. i. p. 208.

[r] See BERN. MONETA in *Summa adversus Catharos et Waldenses*, published at Rome, in the year 1743, by THOM. AUGUST. RICHINI.

CENT.
XII.

ples, were called *Albanenses*, from the name of the place where their spiritual ruler resided; and this sect was subdivided into two, of which one took the name *BALAZINANSA*, bishop of *Verona*, and the other that of *JOHN DE LUGIO*, bishop of *Bergamo*. The sect which adhered to the doctrine of *one eternal principle* was also subdivided into the congregation of *Baioli*, the capital town of the province, and that of *Concoregio*, or *Concorezzo*. The *Albigenses*, who were settled in *France*, belonged to the church or congregation of *Baioli* [5].

VI. In the internal constitution of the church that was founded by this sect there were many rules and principles of a singular nature, which we pass over in silence, as they would oblige us to enter into a detail inconsistent with the brevity we propose to observe in this work. The government of this church was administered by *bishops*, and each bishop had two vicars, of whom one was called the *eldest son*, and the other the *younger*; while the rest of the clergy and doctors were comprehended under the general denomination of *deacons* [1]. The veneration, which the people had for the clergy in general, and more especially for the bishops and their spiritual sons, was carried to a length that almost

who prefixed to it a dissertation concerning the *Cathari*, that was by no means worthy of the highest encomiums. *MONETA* was no mean writer for the time in which he lived. See *Lib. i. p. 2 & 5. Lib. ii. p. 247, &c.*

[5] *RAYNERI SACHONI summa de Catharis et Leonistis* in *MARTENE Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 1761. 1768.—*PEREGRINUS PRISCIANUS* in *MURATORII Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 93. who exhibits, in a sort of table, these different sects, but by a mistake places the *Albigenses*, who were a branch of the *Baiolenses*, in the place of the *Albanenses*; this, perhaps, may be an error of the press. The opinions of these *Baiolenses*, or *Bagnolenses*, may be seen in the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*, which *LIMBORCH* published with his *History of the Inquisition*. The account, however, which we have in that history (*Book I. Ch. VIII.*) of the opinions of the *Albigenses* is by no means accurate. A great variety of causes has contributed to involve in darkness and perplexity the distinct characters of these different sects, whose respective systems we cannot enlarge upon at present.

[1] See *SACHONI summa de Catharis*, p. 1766.

exceeds

exceeds credibility. The discipline observed by this C E N T. sect was so excessively rigid and austere, that it was XII.
 practicable only by a certain number of robust and determined fanatics. But that such as were not able to undergo this discipline might not, on that account, be lost to the cause, it was thought necessary, in imitation of the ancient Manicheans, to divide this sect into two classes, one of which was distinguished by the title of the *consolati*, i. e. *comforted*, while the other received only the denomination of *confederates*. The former gave themselves out for persons of consummate wisdom and extraordinary piety, lived in perpetual celibacy, and led a life of the severest mortification and abstinence, without ever allowing themselves the enjoyment of any worldly comfort. The latter, if we except a few particular rules which they observed, lived like the rest of mankind, but at the same time were obliged by a solemn agreement they had made with the church, and which, in Italian, they called *la convenenza*, to enter before their death, in their last moments, if not sooner, into the class of the *comforted*, and to receive the *consolamentum*, which was the form of inauguration by which they were introduced into that fanatical order [u].

VII. A much more rational sect was that which was founded about the year 1110 in *Languedoc* and *Provence* The Petro-brussians.
 by PETER DE BRUYS, who made the most laudable attempts to reform the abuses and to remove the superstitions that disfigured the beautiful simplicity of the gospel, and after having engaged in his cause a great number of followers, during a laborious ministry of twenty years continuance, was burnt at *St. Giles*, in the year 1130, by an enraged populace set on by the clergy, whose traffic was in danger from the enterprising spirit of this new reformer. The whole system of doctrine which this unhappy martyr, whose zeal was not without a considerable mixture of fanaticism, taught to the *Petrobrussians* his disciples, is not known; it is however

[u] For a farther account of this sect, see the writers mentioned above, and particularly the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanae*.

CENT.
XII.

certain, that the five following tenets made a part of this system; 1. That no persons whatever, were to be baptized before they were come to the full use of their reason. 2. That it was an idle superstition to build churches for the service of God, who will accept of a sincere worship wherever it is offered, and that therefore such churches as had already been erected were to be pulled down and destroyed. 3. That the crucifixes, as instruments of superstition, deserve the same fate. 4. That the real body and blood of Christ were not exhibited in the eucharist, but were merely represented, in that holy ordinance, by their figures and symbols. 5. and lastly, That the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living, could be in no respect advantageous to the dead [w].

The Henricians.

VIII. This innovator was succeeded by another who was an Italian by birth, and whose name was HENRY, the founder and parent of the sect call *Henricians*. It was, no doubt, a rare thing to see a person, who was at the same time monk and hermit, undertaking to reform the superstitions of the times; yet such was the case of HENRY, who leaving *Lausanne*, a city in *Switzerland*, travelled to *Mans*, and being banished thence removed successively to *Poitiers*, *Bordeaux*, and the countries adjacent, and at length to *Toulouse* in the year 1147, exercising his ministerial function in all these places with the utmost applause from the people, and declaiming, with the greatest vehemence and fervour, against the vices of the clergy, and the superstitions they had introduced into the Christian church. At *Toulouse* he was warmly opposed by St. BERNARD, by whose influence he was overpowered, notwithstanding his popularity, and obliged to save himself by flight. But being seized, in his retreat, by a certain bishop, he was carried before pope EUGENIUS III, who presided in person at a council then assembled at *Rheims*, and who, in

[w] See PETRI Venerab. Lib. contra Petrobrussianos in Bibliotheca Clu-
ienfi, p. 1117.—MABILLON *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 346.—BAS-
NAGE, *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, period. iv. p. 140.

confe-

consequence of the accusations brought against HENRY, committed him, in the year 1148, to a close prison, where, in a little time after this, he ended his days [x]. We have no accurate account of the doctrines of this reformer transmitted to our times. All we know of that matter is, that he rejected the baptism of infants; censured with severity the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy; treated the festivals and ceremonies of the church with the utmost contempt; and held clandestine assemblies, in which he explained and inculcated the novelties he taught. Several writers affirm, that he was the disciple of PETER DE BRUYS; but I cannot see upon what evidence or authority this assertion is grounded [y].

IX. While the Henricians were propagating their doctrines in *France*, a certain illiterate man called TANQUELINUS, or TANQUELMUS, arose in *Brabant* about the year 1115, excited the most deplorable commotions at *Antwerp*, and drew after him a most numerous sect. If the accounts that are given us of this heresiarch by his adversaries, may be at all depended upon, he must either have been a monstrous impostor, or an outrageous madman. For he walked in public with the greatest solemnity, pretended to be God, or, at least, the son of God, ordered daughters to be ravished in presence of their mothers, and committed himself the greatest disorders. Such are the enormities that are attributed to TANQUELMUS, but they are absolutely incredible, and therefore cannot be true [z]. What seems most worthy

The horrid
blasphemy of
Tanquelinus.

[x] *Gesta Episcoporum Cenomanens.* in MABILLON, *Analec.* veter. vii, p. 315. ed. Nov.—GAUFRIDI *Epistola* in Lib. vi. *Vita Sti. Bernardi*, tom. ii, Opp. *Bernbard.* p. 1207.—MATTH. *Histor. Major.* p. 71.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Opera Bernardi*, § vi. & *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 346. 420. 434.

[y] That HENRY was the disciple of PETER DE BRUYS is not at all probable; since, not to insist upon other reasons, the latter could not bear the sight of a cross, and in all likelyhood owed his death to the multitude of crucifixes which he had committed to the flames; whereas the former, when he entered into any city, appeared with a cross in his hand, which he bore as a standard, to attract the veneration of the people. See MABILLON, *Analec.* p. 316.

[z] *Epistola Trajectens. Ecclesie ad Tridericum Episcopum de Tanchelmo*,

CENT.
XII.

worthy of credit in this matter is, that this new teacher had imbibed the opinions and spirit of the Mystics; that he treated with contempt the external worship of God, the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and the rite of baptism; and held clandestine assemblies to propagate more effectually his visionary notions. But as besides all this, he inveighed against the clergy, like the other heretics already mentioned, and declaimed against their vices with vehemence and intrepidity, it is probable that these blasphemies were falsely charged upon him by a vindictive priesthood. Be that as it may, the fate of TANQUELMUS was unhappy, for he was assassinated by an ecclesiastic in a cruel manner. His sect, however, did not perish with him, but acquired strength and vigour under the ministry of his disciples, until it was, at length, extinguished by the famous St. NORBERT, the founder of the order of *Præmonstratenses*, or *Prémontrès* [a].

Seditions
excited in
Italy by Ar-
nold of Bres-
cia.

X. In Italy ARNOLD of *Brescia*, a disciple of ABELARD, and a man of extensive erudition and remarkable austerity, but also of a turbulent and impetuous spirit, excited new troubles and commotions both in church and state. He was, indeed, condemned in the council of the Lateran, A. D. 1139, by INNOCENT II, and thereby obliged to retire into *Switzerland*; but upon the death of that pontiff he returned into *Italy*, and raised at *Rome*, during the pontificate of EUGENIUS III, several tumults and seditions among the people, who changed, by his instigation, the government of the city, and insulted the persons of the clergy in the most disorderly manner. He fell however at last a victim to the vengeance of his enemies; for, after various turns of fortune, he was seized, in the year 1155, by a prefect of the city, by whom he was crucified, and afterwards

in SEL. TENGNAGELII *Collectione Veterum Monumentor.* p. 368.—BOULAY *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 98.—ARGENTRE *Collectio Judicior. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 10.

[a] LEWIS HUGO *Vie de S. Norbert*, *Lior.* II. p. 126.—CHRYST. vander STERRE *Vita S. Norberti*, cap. xxxvi. p. 164. & POLYC. de HERTOGHE *ad illam Annotationes*, p. 387.

burned

turned to ashes. This unhappy man seems not to have C R N T.
 adopted any doctrines inconsistent with the spirit of true XII.
 religion, and the principles upon which he acted were
 chiefly reprehensible from their being carried too far, ap-
 plied without discernment and discretion, and executed
 with a degree of vehemence which was as criminal, as it
 was imprudent. Having perceived the discords and a-
 nimosities, the calamities and disorders that sprung from
 the overgrown opulence of the pontiffs and bishops, he
 was persuaded that the interests of the church, and the
 happiness of nations in general required, that the clergy
 should be divested of all their worldly possessions, of all
 their temporal rights and prerogatives. He, therefore,
 maintained publicly, that the treasures and revenues of
 popes, bishops, and monasteries ought to be solemnly
 resigned and transferred to the supreme rulers of each
 state, and that nothing was to be left to the ministers
 of the gospel but a spiritual authority and a subsistence
 drawn from tithes, and from the voluntary oblations
 and contributions of the people [b]. This violent re-
 former, in whose character and manners there were se-
 veral things worthy of esteem, drew after him a great
 number of disciples, who derived from him the denomi-
 nation of *Arnoldists*, and, in succeeding times, discover-
 ed the spirit and intrepidity of their leader, as often as
 any favourable opportunities of reforming the church
 were offered to their zeal.

XI. Of all the sects that arose in this century none was
 more distinguished by the reputation it acquired, by the
 multitude of its votaries, and the testimony which its
 bitterest enemies bore to the probity and innocence of
 its members, than that of the Waldenses, so called from
 their parent and founder PETER WALDUS. This sect
 was known by different denominations. From the place
 where it first appeared its members were called *The poor*

The origin
and history
of the Wal-
denses.

[b] See OTTO *Frising. de gestis Frederici I*, lib. ii. cap. xx.—S. BERNHARDUS *Epist.* 195, 196. tom. i. p. 187. BOULAY *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 157.—MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur. l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, p. 137.—HENR. de BUNAU *Vita Frederici I*, p. 41.—CHAUFFEPED *Nouveau Diction. Hist. Crit.* tom. ii. p. 482.

CENT.
XII.

men of Lions [c], or *Leonists*, and, from the wooden shoes which its doctors wore, and a certain mark that was imprinted upon these shoes, they were called *Insabbatati*, or *Sabbatati* [c]. The origin of this famous sect was as follows: PETER, an opulent merchant of *Lions*, surnamed *Valdensis*, or *Validisus*, from *Vaux*, or *Waldum*, a town of the marquissate of *Lions*, being extremely zealous for the advancement of true piety and Christian knowledge, employed, [d] a certain priest [e], about the year 1160, in translating from Latin into French the *Four Gospels*, with other books of holy scripture and the most remarkable sentences of the ancient doctors, which were so highly esteemed in this century. But no sooner had he perused these sacred books with a proper degree of attention, than he perceived that the religion, which was now taught in the Roman church, differed totally from that which was originally inculcated by CHRIST and his apostles. Struck with this glaring contradiction between the doctrines of the pontiffs and the truths of the gospel, and animated, with a pious zeal, for promoting his own salvation and that of others, he abandoned his mercantile vocation, and distributed his riches among the poor [f], and forming an association with other pious men, who had adopted his sentiments and his turn of devotion, he began, in the year 1180, to as-

[c] They were called *Leonists* from *Leona*, the ancient name of *Lyons*, where their sect took its rise. The more eminent persons of that sect manifested their progress toward perfection by the simplicity and meanness of their external appearance. Hence, among other things, they wore wooden shoes, which in the French language are termed *sabots*, and had imprinted upon these shoes the sign of the cross to distinguish themselves from other Christians; and it was on these accounts that they acquired the denominations of *sabbatati* and *insabbatati*. See DU FRESNE *Glossarium Latin. medii ævi*, vi. voce *Sabbatati*, p. 4.—NICOL. EUMERICI *Directorium Inquisitorum*, part. III. N 112, &c.

[d] See STEPH. de BORBONE *De septem donis spiritus sancti*, in ECHARD & QUETIF *Bibliotheca Scriptor. Dominicanor.* tom. i. p. 192.—ANONYM. *Tractatio de Hæresi Pauperum de Lugduno*, in MARTENE *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 1777.

[e] This priest was called STEPHANUS DE EVISA.

[f] It was on this account that the Waldenses were called *Paupers de Lions*, or *poor men of Lions*.

sume the quality of a public teacher, and to instruct the multitude in the doctrines and precepts of Christianity. The archbishop of *Lions*, and the other rulers of the church in that province, opposed, with vigour, this new doctor in the exercise of his ministry. But their opposition was unsuccessful; for the purity and simplicity of that religion which these good men taught, the spotless innocence that shone forth in their lives and actions, and the noble contempt of riches and honours which was conspicuous in the whole of their conduct and conversation, appeared so engaging to all such as had any sense of true piety, that the number of their disciples and followers increased from day to day [g]. They accordingly formed religious assemblies, first in *France*, and afterwards in *Lombardy*, from whence they propagated their sect throughout the other provinces of *Europe* with an incredible rapidity, and with such invincible fortitude, that neither fire, nor sword, nor the most cruel inventions of merciless persecution could damp their zeal, or entirely ruin their cause [b].

CENT
XII.

XII. The

[g] Certain writers give different accounts of the origin of the *Waldenses*, and suppose that they were so called from the *Vallies* in which they had resided for many ages before the birth of PETER WALDUS. But these writers have no authority to support this assertion, and, besides this, they are refuted amply by the best historians. I don't mean to deny, that there were in the *Vallies of Piedmont*, long before this period, a set of men who differed widely from the opinions adopted and inculcated by the church of *Rome*, and whose doctrine resembled, in many respects, that of the *Waldenses*; all that I maintain is, that these inhabitants of the *Vallies* above mentioned are to be carefully distinguished from the *Waldenses*, who, according to the unanimous voice of history, were originally inhabitants of *Lyons*, and derived their name from PETER WALDUS, their founder and chief.

[b] See the following ancient writers, who have given accounts of the sect in question, to wit, SACHONI *Summa contra Valdenses*.—MONETE *Summa contra Catharos et Valdenses*, published by RICHINI.—*Tr. di Hæresi Pauperum de Lugduno*, published by MARTENE in his *Thesaurus Anecd.* tom. v. p. 1777.—PILICHDORFFIUS *contra Valdenses*, t. xxv. B. B. *Max. Patr.*—Add to these authors, JO. PAUL PERRIN *Histoire des Vaudois*, published at *Geneva* in 1619.—JO. LEGER *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*, livr. i. ch. xiv. p. 136.—USSERI *De Successione Ecclesiarum Occidentis*, cap. viii. p. 209.—JAC. BASNAGE

CENT.
XII.

The doctrine, discipline, and views of the Waldenses.

XII. The attempts of PETER WALDUS and his followers were neither employed, nor designed to introduce new doctrines into the church, nor to propose new articles of faith to Christians. All they aimed at was, to reduce the form of ecclesiastical government, and the lives and manners both of the clergy and people, to that amiable simplicity, and that primitive sanctity that characterised the apostolic ages, and which appear so strongly recommended in the precepts and injunctions of the divine author of our holy religion. In consequence of this design, they complained that the Roman church had degenerated, under CONSTANTINE the great, from its primitive purity and sanctity. They denied the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and maintained that the rulers and ministers of the church were obliged, by their vocation, to imitate the poverty of the apostles, and to procure for themselves a subsistence by the work of their hands. They considered every Christian, as in a certain measure qualified and authorized to instruct, exhort, and confirm the brethren in their Christian course, and demanded the restoration of the ancient penitential discipline of the church, *i. e.* the expiation of transgressions by prayer, fasting, and alms, which the new-invented doctrine of *indulgences* had almost totally abolished. They, at the same time, affirmed, that every pious Christian was qualified and entitled to prescribe to the penitent the kind and degree of *satisfaction* or expiation that their transgressions required; that confession made to priests was by no means necessary, since the humble offender might acknowledge his sins and testify his repentance to any true believer, and might expect from such the councils and admonitions that his case and circumstances demanded. They maintained, that the power of delivering sinners from the guilt and punishment of their offences belonged to God

BASNAGE *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i. period. iv. p. 329.—THOM. AUGUST. RICHINI *Dissertat. de Valdensibus*, prefixed to his edition of the *Summa* MONETÆ, p. 36.—BOULAY *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 292.

alone,

alone, and that *indulgences*, of consequence, were the criminal inventions of sordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were instituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, useless, and absurd, and denied the existence of departed souls in an intermediate state of purification, affirming, that they were immediately, upon their separation from the body, received into heaven, or thrust down to hell. These and other tenets of a like nature composed the system of doctrine propagated by the Waldenses. Their rules of practice were extremely austere; for they adopted, as the model of their moral discipline, the sermon of CHRIST on the mount, which they interpreted and explained in the most rigorous and literal manner, and, of consequence, prohibited and condemned in their society all wars, and suits of law, all attempts towards the acquisition of wealth, the inflicting of capital punishments, self-defence against unjust violence, and oaths of all kinds [i].

XIII. The government of the church was committed, by the Waldenses, to *bishops* [k], *presbyters*, and *deacons*; for they acknowledged, that these three ecclesiastical orders were instituted by CHRIST himself. But they looked upon it as absolutely necessary, that all these orders should resemble exactly the apostles of the divine Saviour, and be, like them, illiterate, poor, destitute of all worldly possessions, and furnished with some laborious trade or vocation in order to gain by constant in-

The form of church government among the Waldenses.

[i] See the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*, published by LIMBORCH, as also the *Summa MONETÆ contra Waldenses*, and the other writers of the Waldensian history. Though these writers are not equally accurate, nor perfectly agreed about the number of doctrines, that entered into the system of this sect, yet they are almost all unanimous in acknowledging the sincere piety and exemplary conduct of the Waldenses, and shew plainly enough that their intention was not to oppose the doctrines that were universally received among Christians, but only to revive the piety and manners of the primitive times, and to combat the vices of the clergy, and the abuses that had been introduced into the worship and discipline of the church.

[k] The bishops were also called *maiores*, or *elders*.

CENT.

XII.

dustry their daily subsistence [1]. The laity were divided into two classes; one of which contained the *perfect*, and the other the *imperfect* Christians. The former spontaneously divested themselves of all worldly possessions, manifested, in the wretchedness of their apparel, their excessive poverty, and emaciated their bodies by frequent fasting. The latter lived in a less austere manner, and approached nearer to the method of living generally received, though they abstained, like the graver sort of anabaptists in latter times, from all appearance of pomp and luxury. It is, however, to be observed, that the Waldenses were not without their intestine divisions. Such of them as lived in *Italy* differed considerably in their opinions from those who dwelt in *France* and the other European nations. The former considered the church of *Rome* as the church of CHRIST, though much corrupted and sadly disfigured; they acknowledged moreover the validity of its seven sacraments, and solemnly declared that they would continue always in communion with it, provided they might be allowed to live as they thought proper, without molestation or restraint. The latter affirmed, on the contrary, that the church of *Rome* had apostatized from CHRIST, was deprived of the holy spirit, and was, in reality, that *whore of Babylon* mentioned in the *Revelations of St. JOHN* [m].

Sects of a
less eminent
kind
The Pafagi-
ni,

XIV. Besides these famous sects, which made a great noise in the world, and drew after them multitudes from the bosom of a corrupt and superstitious church, there

[1] The greatest part of the *Waldenses* gained their livelihood by weaving; hence the whole sect in certain places were called the *sect of weavers*.

[m] MONET *Summa contra Catharos et Valdenses*, p. 406. 416, &c. They seem to have been also divided in their sentiments concerning the possession of worldly goods, as appear from the accounts of STEPHANUS DE BORBONE, in ECHARDI *Scriptoribus Dominicanis*, tom. i. p. 191. This writer divides the *Waldenses* into two classes; *The poor men of Lions*, and *The poor men of Lombardy*. The former rejected and prohibited all sorts of possessions; the latter looked upon worldly possessions as lawful. This distinction may be also confirmed by several passages of other ancient authors.

were

were other religious *factions* of lesser importance, which arose in *Italy*, and more especially in *France*, though they seem to have expired soon after their birth [n]. In *Lombardy*, which was the principal residence of the Italian heretics, there sprung up a very singular sect, known by the denomination of *Pasaginians* [o], and also by that of the *circumcised*. Like the other sects already mentioned, they had the utmost aversion to the dominion and discipline of the church of *Rome*; but they were, at the same time, distinguished by two religious tenets that were peculiar to themselves. The first was a notion, that the observation of the law of *Moses*, in every thing except the offering of sacrifices, was obligatory upon christians, in consequence of which they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats, the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic œconomy, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. The second tenet that distinguished this sect was advanced in opposition to the doctrine of three persons in the divine nature; for the *Pasaginians* maintained that *CHRIST* was no more than the *first and purest creature of God*; nor will their adopting this opinion seem so surprising, if we consider the prodigious number of Arians that were scattered throughout *Italy* long before this period of time [p].

XV. A set of fanatics, called *Caputiati*, from a singular kind of cap that was the badge of their faction, infested the province of *Burgundy*, the diocese of *Auxerre*, and several other parts of *France*, in all which places they excited much disturbance among the people. They wore upon their caps a leaden image of the Virgin *MARY*, and they declared publicly, that their purpose was to level all distinctions, to abrogate magistracy, to

The Caputiati.

[n] For an account of these obscure sects, see *STEPHANUS DE BORBONE*, in *ECHARDI Scriptoribus Dominicanis*, tom. i. p. 191.

[o] The origin of the name of *Pasagini*, or *Pasagii*, is not known.

[p] See *F. BONACURSI Manifestatio hæresis Catharorum*, in *LUC. DACHERII Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 211. edit. nov.—*GERHARD BERGAMENSIS contra Catharos et Pasagios*, in *LUD. ANTON. MURATORI Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 151.

GENT. XII. remove all subordination among mankind, and to restore that primitive liberty, that natural equality that were the inestimable privileges of the first mortals. Hugo bishop of *Auxerre*, attacked these disturbers of human society in the proper manner, employing against them the force of arms, instead of arguments [9].

The sect of the *apostolics*; whom St. BERNARD opposed with such bitterness and fury, and were so called, as that zealous abbot himself acknowledged, because they professed to exhibit in their lives and manners the piety and virtue of the holy apostles; were very different from the audacious heretics now mentioned. They were a clownish set of men, of the lowest birth, who gained their subsistence by bodily labour; and yet no sooner did they form themselves into a sect, than they drew after them a multitude of adherents of all ranks and orders. Their religious doctrine, as St. BERNARD confesses, was free from error, and their lives and manners were irreproachable and exemplary. Yet they were reprehensible on account of the following peculiarities: 1. They held it unlawful to take an oath. 2. They suffered their hair and their beards to grow to an enormous length, so that their aspect was inexpressibly extravagant and savage. 3. They preferred celibacy before wedlock, and called themselves the *chaste brethren and sisters*. Notwithstanding which, 4. Each man had a spiritual sister with him, after the manner of the apostles, with whom he lived in a domestic relation, lying in the same chamber with her, though not in the same bed [r].

Eon, a
wronghead-
ed fanatic.

XVI. In the council, which was assembled at *Rheims* in the year 1148, and at which pope EUGENIUS III presided, a certain gentleman of the province of *Bretagne*, whose name was EON, and whose brain was, undoubtedly, disordered, was condemned for pretending to be the

[9] JAC. LE BOEUF *Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 317.

[r] St. BERNHARDUS *Sermo LXV, in Canticum*, tom. iv. Opp. p. 1495. edit. *Mabillon*.

son of God. Having heard in the form that was used for exorcising malignant spirits, these words pronounced: *per EUM, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*, he concluded from the resemblance that there was between the word EUM, and his name, that he was the person who was come to judge both quick and dead. This poor man should rather have been delivered over to the physicians, than placed in the list of heretics. He ended his days miserably in a prison, and left a considerable number of followers and adherents, whom persecution and death in the most dreadful forms could not persuade to abandon his cause, or to renounce an absurdity, which one would think could never have gained credit, but in such a place as Bedlam [5]. This remarkable example is sufficient to shew, not only the astonishing credulity of the stupid multitude, but also how far even the rulers of the church were destitute of judgment, and strangers to the knowledge of true and genuine religion.

[5] MATTH. PARIS, *Historia Major*, p. 68.—GUL. NEUBRIGEN-
SIS, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, lib. i. p. 50.—BOULAY, *Historia Acad.*
Parisiensis, tom. ii. p. 241.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT.
XIII.

The state of
Christianity
in the nor-
thern parts
of *Asia* and
in *China*.

I. **T**HOUGH the successors of GENGIS-KAN, the mighty emperor of the Tartars, or rather of the Mogols, had carried their victorious arms through a great part of *Asia*, and having reduced *China*, *India*, and *Persia* under their yoke, involved in many calamities and sufferings the Christian assemblies which were established in these vanquished lands[a]; yet we learn from the best accounts and the most respectable authorities, that both in *China* and in the Northern parts of *Asia* the Nestorians continued to have a flourishing church, and a great number of adherents. The emperors of the Tartars and Mogols had no great aversion to the Christian religion; nay, it appears from authentic records, that several kings and grandees of these nations had either been instructed in the doctrines of the gospel by their ancestors, or were converted to Christianity by

[a] GREGOR. ABULPHARAIUS, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 281.

by the ministry and exhortations of the Nestorians [b]. But the religion of MAHOMET, which was so adapted to flatter the passions of men, infected, by degrees, these noble converts, opposed with success the progress of the gospel, and, in process of time, triumphed over it so far, that not the least glimpse, or remains of Christianity, were to be perceived in the courts of these eastern princes.

II. The Tartars having made an incursion into *Europe* in the year 1741, and having laid waste, with the most unrelenting and savage barbarity, *Hungary, Poland, Silesia*, and the adjacent countries, the Roman pontiffs thought it incumbent upon them to endeavour to claim the fury, and soften the ferocity of these new and formidable enemies. For this purpose INNOCENT IV sent an embassy to the Tartars, which consisted in a certain number of Dominican and Franciscan friars [c]. In the year 1274, ABAKA, the emperor of that fierce nation, sent ambassadors to the council of *Lyons*, which was held under the pontificate of GREGORY X [d]. About four years after this, pope NICOLAS III paid the same compliment to COBLAI, emperor of the whole Tartar nation, to whom he sent a solemn embassy of the Franciscan monks, with a view to render that prince propitious to the Christian cause. The last expedition of this kind that we shall mention at present, was that of JOHANNES à MONTE CORVINO, who was sent in company with other ecclesiastics to the same emperor by NICOLAS IV, and who carried letters to the Nestorians from

A papal embassy is sent to the Tartars.

[b] See MARC. PAUL VENETUS, *De Regionibus Oriental.* lib. i. c. iv. lib. ii. c. vi.—HAYTHO, the Armenian's *Histor. Oriental.* cap. xix. p. 35. cap. xxxiii. p. 39. cap. xxiv. p. 41.—JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 526. See particularly the *Ecclesiastical History of the Tartars*, published in Latin at *Helmstadt*, in the year 1714, in 4to.

[c] See LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 116. 149. 175. 256.

[d] WADDING, *loc. cit.* tom. iv. p. 35. tom. v. p. 128. See particularly an accurate and ample account of the negotiations that passed between the pontiffs and the Tartars, in the *Historia Ecclesiastica Tartarorum*, already mentioned.

CENT.
XIII.

that zealous pontiff. This mission was far from being useless, since these spiritual ambassadors converted many of the Tartars to Christianity, engaged considerable numbers of the Nestorians to adopt the doctrine and discipline of the church of *Rome*, and erected churches in different parts of *Tartary* and *China*. In order to accelerate the propagation of the gospel among these darkened nations, JOHANNES à MONTE CORVINO translated the *New Testament* and the *Psalms* of DAVID into the language of the Tartars [e].

Crusades renewed.

III. The Roman pontiffs employed their most zealous and assiduous efforts in the support of the Christian cause in *Palestine*, which was now in a most declining or rather in a desperate state. They had learnt, by a delicious experience, how much these Asiatic wars, undertaken from a principle, or at least carried on under a pretext of religion, had contributed to fill their coffers, augment their authority, and cover them with glory, and therefore they had nothing more at heart than the renewal and prolongation of these sacred expeditions [f]. INNOCENT III, therefore, founded the charge; but the greatest part of the European princes and nations were deaf to the voice of the holy trumpet. At length, however, after many unsuccessful attempts in different countries, a certain number of French nobles entered into an alliance with the republic of *Venice*, and set sail for the east with an army, that was far from being formidable. Besides; the event of this new expedition was by no means answerable to the expectation of the pontiff. The French and Venetians, instead of steering their course towards *Palestine*, sailed directly for *Constantinople*, and, in the year 1203, took that im-

[e] ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Annal. Ecclesiastic.* tom. xiv. ad A. 1278. § 17. p. 282. & ad A. 1289. § 59. p. 419. ed. Colon.—PIERRE BERGERON, *Traité des Tartares*, chap. xi. p. 61. See also the writers mentioned in the *Historia Ecclesiastica Tartarorum*.

[f] This is remarked by the writers of the xiith century, who had so soon perceived the avaritious and despotic views of the pontiffs in the encouragement they gave to the crusades. See MATTH. PARIS, *Hist. Major*, p. 174. 365. et passim.

perial city by storm, with a design to restore to the throne ISAAC ANGELUS, who implored their succour against the violence of his brother ALEXIUS, who had usurped the empire. The year following a dreadful sedition was raised at *Constantinople*, in which the emperor ISAAC was put to death, and his son the young ALEXIUS was strangled by ALEXIUS DUCAS, the ring-leader of this furious faction [g]. The account of this parricide no sooner came to the ears of the chiefs of the crusade than they made themselves masters of *Constantinople* for the second time, dethroned and drove from the city the tyrant DUCAS, and elected BALDWIN, count of *Flanders*, emperor of the Greeks. This proceeding was a source of new divisions; for about two years after this the Greeks resolved to set up, in opposition to this Latin emperor, one of their own nation, and elected for that purpose THEODORE LASCARIS, who chose *Nice* in *Bithynia* for the place of his imperial residence. From this period until the year 1261, two emperors reigned over the Greeks; the one of their own nation, who resided at *Nice*; and the other of the Latin or French extraction, who lived at *Constantinople*, the ancient metropolis of their empire. But in the year 1261, the face of things were changed by the Grecian emperor MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, who, by the valour and stratagems of his general CÆSAR ALEXIUS, became master of *Constantinople*, and forced the Latin emperor BALDWIN II to abandon that city, and save himself by flight in *Italy*. Thus fell the empire of the Franks at *Constantinople*, after a duration of fifty-seven years [b].

[(g) The learned authors of the *Universal History* call this ring-leader, by mistake JOHN DUCAS.]

[b] See, for a full account of this empire, DU FRESNE *Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople sous les Empereurs François*; in the former part of which we find the *Histoire de la Conquête de la ville de Constantinople par les François*, written by GODFREY DE VILLE HARDUIN, one of the French chiefs concerned in the expedition. This work makes a part of the Byzantine history. See also CLAUDE FONTENAY, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. x. p. 216.—GUNTHERI *Monachi. Histor. captæ à Latinis Constantinopoleos*, in HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 1.—INNOCENTII III. *Epistol. à Baluzio editas*, passim.

Another
crusade
undertaken.

IV. Another sacred expedition was undertaken in the year 1217, under the pontificate of HONORIUS III, by the confederate arms of *Italy* and *Germany*. The allied army was commanded in chief by ANDREW, king of *Hungary*, who was joined by LEOPOLD, duke of *Austria*, LEWIS of *Bavaria*, and several other princes. After a few months absence, ANDREW returned into *Europe*. The remaining chiefs carried on the war with vigour, and, in the year 1220, made themselves masters of *Damietta*, the strongest city in *Egypt*; but their prosperity was of a short duration, for the year following their fleet was totally ruined by that of the Saracens, their provision cut off, and their army reduced to the greatest straits and difficulties. This irreparable loss was followed by that of *Damietta*, which blasted all their hopes, and removed the flattering prospects which their successful beginnings had presented to their expectations [i].

An histori-
cal view of
the other
crusades
each in their
order.

V. The legates and missionaries of the court of *Rome* still continued to animate the languishing zeal of the European princes in behalf of the Christian cause in *Palestine*, and to revive the spirit of crusading, which so many calamities and disasters had almost totally extinguished. At length, in consequence of their lively remonstrances, a new army was raised, and a new expedition undertaken, which excited great expectations, and drew the attention of *Europe*, and that so much the more, as it was generally believed that this army was to be commanded by the emperor FREDERIC II. That prince had, indeed, obliged himself by a solemn promise made to the Roman pontiff, to take upon him the direction of this expedition, and what added a new degree of force to this engagement, and seemed to render the violation of it impossible, was the marriage that FREDERIC had contracted, in the year 1223, with JOLANDA, daughter of JOHN, count of *Brienne*, and king

[i] See JAC. DE VITRIACO, *Histor. Oriental.* & MARTIN. SANC-TUS, *Secret. fidel. crucis inter Bongarsianos de sacris bellis scriptores, seu gesta Dei per Francos.*

of *Jerusalem*, by which alliance that kingdom was to be added to his European dominions. Yet notwithstanding all this, the emperor put off his voyage from time to time under various pretexts, and did not set out until the year 1228, when, after having been excommunicated on account of his delay by the incensed pontiff GREGORY IX [k], he followed with a small train of attendants the troops, who expected, with the most anxious impatience, his arrival at *Palestine*. No sooner did he land in that disputed kingdom, than, instead of carrying on the war with vigour, he turned all his thoughts towards peace, and without consulting the other princes and chiefs of the crusade, concluded, in the year 1229, a treaty of peace, or rather a truce, of ten years with MELIC-CAMEL, sultan of *Egypt*. The principal thing stipulated in this treaty was, that FREDERIC should be put in possession of the city and kingdom of *Jerusalem*; this condition was immediately executed, and the emperor, entering into the city with great pomp, and accompanied by a numerous train, placed the crown upon his head with his own hands, and, having thus settled matters in *Palestine*, he returned without delay into *Italy*, to appease the discords and commotions which the vindictive and ambitious pontiff had excited there in his absence. So that in reality, notwithstanding all the reproaches that were cast upon the emperor by the pope and his creatures, this expedition was by far the most successful of any that had been yet undertaken against the infidels [l].

C. E. N. T.
XIII.

VI. The

[(k) This papal excommunication, which was drawn up in the most outrageous and indecent language, was so far from exciting FREDERIC to accelerate his departure for *Palestine*, that it produced no effect upon him at all, and was, on the contrary, received with the utmost contempt. He defended himself by his ambassadors at *Rome*, and shewed that the reasons of his delay were solid and just, and not mere pretexts as the pope had pretended. At the same time, he wrote a remarkable letter to HENRY III, king of *England*, in which he complains of the insatiable avarice, the boundless ambition, the perfidious and hypocritical proceedings of the Roman pontiffs. See FLEURY, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, livr. lxxix. tom. xvi. p. 601. edit *Bruxelles*.]

[l] See the writers that have composed the History of the holy Wars,
F f 4 and

CENT.
XIII.

VI. The expeditions that followed this, were less important and also less successful. In the year 1239, THEOBALD VI, [m], count of *Champagne*, and king of *Navarre*, set out from *Marseilles* for the Holy land, accompanied by several French and German princes, as did also, the year following RICHARD, Earl of *Cornwal*, brother to HENRY III, king of *England*. The issue of these two expeditions was by no means answerable to the preparations which were made to render them successful. The former failed through the influence of the emperor's [n] ambassadors in *Palestine*, who renewed the truce with the Mahometans; while, on the other hand, a considerable body of Christians were defeated at *Gaza*, and such as escaped the carnage returned into *Europe*. This fatal event was principally owing to the discords that reigned between the templars, and the knights of St. JOHN of *Jerusalem*. Hence it came to pass, that the arrival of RICHARD, which had been industriously retarded by GREGORY IX, and which had revived, in some degree, the hopes of the vanquished, was ineffectual to repair their loss, and all that this prince could do, was to enter, with the consent of the allies, into a truce upon as good conditions as the declining state of their affairs would admit of. This truce was accordingly concluded with the sultan of *Egypt* in the year 1241, after which RICHARD immediately set sail for *Europe* [o].

and of the Life and exploits of FREDERIC II. See also MURATORI *Annales Italiæ*, and the various authors of the German history.

[(m) Dr. MOSHEIM calls him, by a mistake, THEOBALD V. unless we are to attribute this fault to an error of the press.]

[(n) FREDERIC II, who had still a great party in *Palestine*, and did not act in concert with the clergy and the creatures of his bitter enemy GREGORY IX, from which division the Christian cause suffered much.]

[o] All these circumstances are accurately related and illustrated by the learned GEORGE CHRIST. GEBEVERUS, in his *Historia Richardi Imperatoris*, lib. i. p. 34 — It appears, however, by the *Epistolæ Petri de Vineis*, that RICHARD was created by FREDERIC II, his lord lieutenant of the kingdom of *Jerusalem*, and this furnishes a probable reason why GREGORY IX used all possible means to retard RICHARD's voyage.

VII. The

VII. The affairs of the Christians in the east declined CENT. XIII.
 from day to day. Intestine discords and ill-conducted

expeditions had reduced them almost to the last extremity, when LEWIS, king of *France*, who was canonised after his death, and is still worshipped with the utmost devotion, attempted their restoration. It was

The expedition of
 Lewis IX.

in consequence of a vow, which this prince had made in the year 1248, when he was seized with a painful and dangerous illness, that he undertook this arduous task, and, in the execution of it, he set sail for *Egypt* with a formidable army and a numerous fleet, from a notion that the conquest of this province would enable him to carry on the war in *Syria* and *Palestine* with more facility and success. The first attempts of the zealous monarch were crowned with victory; for *Damietta*, that famous Egyptian city, yielded to his arms; but the smiling prospect was soon changed, and the progress of the war presented one uniform scene of calamity and desolation. The united horrors of famine and pestilence overwhelmed the royal army, whose provisions were cut off by the Mahometans, in the year 1250; ROBERT, earl of *Artois*, the king's own brother, having surprized the Saracen army, and, through an excess of valour, pursued them too far, was slain in the engagement, and, a few days after, the king himself with two more of his brothers [p], and the greatest part of his army, were taken prisoners in a bloody action after a bold and obstinate resistance. This valiant monarch, who was endowed with true greatness of mind, and who was extremely pious, though after the manner that prevailed in this age of superstition and darkness, was ransomed at an immense price [q], and after having

[(p) ALPHONSUS, earl of *Poitiers*, and CHARLES, earl of *Anjou*.]

[(q) The ransom, which, together with the restoration of *Damietta*, the king was obliged to pay for his liberty, was eight hundred thousand gold bezants, and not eighty thousand as COLLIER erroneously reckons *. This sum, which was equal then to 500,000 livres of French money, would, in our days, amount to the value of four millions of livres, that is, to about 190,000 pounds sterling.]

* See COLLIER's *Eccles. History*, Cent. XIII. vol. i. p. 456.

CENT.
XIII.

A second
crusade un-
dertaken by
the same
monarch.

spent about four years in *Palestine*, returned into *France*, in the year 1252, with a handful of men [r], the miserable remains of his formidable army.

VIII. No calamities could deject the courage, nor damp the invincible spirit of LEWIS; nor did he look upon his vow as fulfilled by what he had already done in *Palestine*. He therefore resolved upon a new expedition, fitted out a formidable fleet with which he set sail for *Africa*, accompanied by a splendid train of princes and nobles, and proposed to begin in that part of the world his operations against the infidels, that he might either convert them to the Christian faith, or draw from their treasures the means of carrying on more effectually the war in *Asia*. Immediately after his arrival upon the *African* coast, he made himself master of the fort of *Carthage*; but this first success was soon followed by a fatal change in his affairs. A pestilential disease broke out in the fleet, in the harbour of *Tunis*, carried off the greatest part of the army, and seized, at length, the monarch himself, who fell a victim to its rage, on the 25th of August, in the year 1270 [s]. LEWIS was the last of the European princes, that embarked in the holy war; the dangers and difficulties, the calamities and disorders, and the enormous expences that accompanied each crusade, disgusted the most zealous, and discouraged the most intrepid promoters of these fanatical expeditions. In consequence of this the Latin em-

[r] Of 2800 illustrious knights, who set out with LEWIS from *France*, there remained but about an hundred when he sailed from *Palestine*. See JOINVILLE'S *Hist. de S. Louis IX.* p. 81.

[s] Among the various histories that deserve to be consulted for an ampler account of this last crusade, the principal place is due to the *Histoire de S. Louis IX du nom, Roy de France, écrite par Jean Sr. de Joinville, enrichie de nouvelles Dissertations et Observations Historiques, par Charles du Fresne, Paris 1668, Fol.* See also FILLEAU DE LA CHAIZE *Histoire de S. Louis, Paris 1688, 2 vol. in 8vo.*—MENCONIS *Chronicon*, in ANT. MATTHÆI *Analektis veteris ævi*, tom. iii. p. 172. 179.—LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Minorum*, tom. iv. p. 294. 307, & *passim*.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 212. 392, &c.—PIERRE CLAUDE FONTENAY, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. xi. p. 337. 405. 575.

pire

pire in the east declined apace, notwithstanding the efforts of the Roman pontiffs to maintain and support it; and in the year 1291, after the taking of *Ptolomais*, or *Acra*, by the Mahometans, it was entirely overthrown [1]. It is natural to inquire into the true causes, that contributed to this unhappy revolution in *Palestine*; and these causes are evident. We must not seek for them either in the counsels, or in the valour of the infidels, but in the dissensions that reigned in the Christian armies, in the profligate lives of those, who called themselves the champions of the cross, and in the ignorance and obstinacy, the avarice and insolence of the pope's legates.

IX. Christianity as yet had not tamed the ferocity, nor conquered the Pagan superstitions and prejudices that still prevailed in some of the western provinces. Among others, the Prussians, a fierce and savage nation, retained still the idolatrous worship of their ancestors with the most obstinate perseverance, nor did the arguments and exhortations employed by the missionaries that were sent among them, from time to time, produce the least effect upon their stubborn and intractable spirits. The brutish firmness of these Pagans induced CONRAD, duke of *Massovia*, to have recourse to more forcible methods than reason and argument, in order to bring about their conversion. For this purpose, he addressed himself, in the year 1230, to the knights of the Teutonic order of St. MARY, who, after their expulsion from *Palestine*, had settled at *Venice*, and engaged them, by pompous promises, to undertake the conquest and conversion of the Prussians. The knights accordingly arrived in *Prussia*, under the command of HERMAN DE SALTZA, and, after a most cruel and obstinate war, of fifty years standing, with that resolute people, obliged them, with difficulty, to acknowledge the Teutonic order for their sovereigns, and to em-

Conversion
of the Prus-
sians.

[1] ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. v. p. 748.—JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 422.—IMOLA in *Dantem*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Italiae, medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1111, 1112.

CENT.
XIII.

brace the Christian faith [u]. After having established Christianity, and fixed their own dominion in *Prussia*, these booted apostles made several excursions into the neighbouring countries, and particularly into *Lithuania*, where they pillaged, burned, massacred, and ruined all before them, until they forced the inhabitants of that miserable province to profess a feigned submission to the gospel, or rather to the furious and unrelenting missionaries, by whom it was propagated in a manner so contrary to its divine maxims, and to the benevolent spirit of its celestial author [w].

Of the Ara-
bians in
Spain.

X. In *Spain* the cause of the gospel gained ground from day to day. The kings of *Castile*, *Leon*, *Navarre*, and *Arragon* waged perpetual war with the Saracen princes, who held still under their dominion the kingdoms of *Valentia*, *Granada*, and *Murcia*, together with the province of *Andalusia*; and this war was carried on with such success, that the Saracen dominion declined apace, and was daily reduced within narrower bounds, while the limits of the church were extended on every side. The princes that contributed principally to this happy revolution were FERDINAND, king of *Leon* and *Castile*, who, after his death, obtained a place in the Kalendar, his father ALPHONSUS IX, king of *Leon*, and JAMES I, king of *Arragon* [x]. The latter, more especially, distinguished himself eminently by his fervent zeal for the advancement of Christianity; for no sooner had he made himself master of *Valentia* in the year 1236, than he employed, with the greatest pains and assiduity, every possible method of converting to the

[u] See MATTHÆI *Analeſta vet. ævi*, tom. iii. p. 18. tom. v. p. 684—689.—PETRI DE DUISBURG *Chronicon Prussiæ*, published by HARTKNOCHIUS at *Jena*, in the year 1679.—CHRISTOPH. HARTKNOCHIUS, his *History of the Prussian Church*, written in the German language, book I. ch. i. p. 33. and *Antiquitates Prussiæ*, Diss. xiv. p. 201. BALUZII *Miscellanea*, tom. vii. p. 427. 478.—WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 40. 63.—SOLIGNAC *Histoire de Pologne*, tom. ii. p. 238.

[w] Besides the authors mentioned in the preceding note, see LUDWEGII *Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum omnis ævi*, tom. i. p. 336.

[x] See JOH. FERRERAS, *History of Spain*, vol. iv.

faith

faith his Arabian subjects, whose expulsion would have been an irreparable loss to his kingdom. For this purpose he ordered the Dominicans, whose ministry he made use of principally in this salutary work, to learn the Arabic tongue, and he founded public schools at *Majorca* and *Barcelona*, in which a considerable number of youth were educated in a manner that might enable them to preach the gospel in that language. When these pious efforts were found to be ineffectual, the Roman pontiff CLEMENT IV exhorted the king to drive the Mahometans out of *Spain*. The obsequious prince followed the counsel of the inconsiderate pontiff, in the execution of which, however, he met with much difficulty, both from the opposition which the Spanish nobles made to it on the one hand, and from the obstinacy of the Moors on the other [y].

C H A P. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

I. **T**HE accounts we have already given of the conquests of the Tartars, and of the unhappy issue of the crusades, will be sufficient to give us a lively idea of the melancholy condition to which the Christians were reduced in *Asia*; and had the Saracens been infected with the same odious spirit of persecution that possessed the crusaders, there would not perhaps have remained a single Christian in that part of the world. But though these infidels were chargeable with various crimes, and had frequently treated the Christians in a rigorous and injurious manner, yet they looked with horror upon those scenes of persecution, which the Latins exhibited as the exploits of heroic piety, and considered it as the highest and most atrocious mark of cruelty and injustice to force unhappy men, by

The unhappy state of the affairs of the Christians in the east.

[y] See GEDDES, his *History of the Expulsion of the Moriscoes*, in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. i. p. 26.

CENT.
XIII.

fire and sword, to abandon their religious principles or to put them to death merely because they refused to change their opinions. After the destruction of the kingdom of *Jerusalem*, many of the Latins remained still in *Syria*, and retiring into the dark and solitary recesses of mount *Liban*, lived there in a savage manner, and lost, by degrees, all sense both of religion and humanity, as appear in the conduct and characters of their descendants who still inhabit the same uncultivated wilds, and who seem almost entirely destitute of all knowledge of God and religion [z].

Complaints
of infidelity
and atheism
among the
Latins.

II. The Latin writers of this age complain in many places of the growth of infidelity, of daring and licentious writers, some of whom attacked publicly the doctrines of Christianity, while others went so far as atheistically to call in question the perfections and government of the supreme Being. These complaints however they might have been exaggerated in some respects, were yet far from being entirely destitute of foundation; and the superstition of the times was too naturally adapted to create a number of infidels and libertines, among men who had more capacity than judgment, more wit than solidity. Persons of this character, when they fixed their attention only upon that absurd system of religion, which the Roman pontiffs and their dependents exhibited as the true religion of CHRIST, and maintained by the odious influence of bloody persecution, were, for want of the means of being better instructed, unhappily led to consider the Christian religion as a fable invented and propagated by a greedy and ambitious priesthood, in order to fill their coffers and to render their authority respectable. The philosophy of ARISTOTLE, which flourished in all the European schools, and was

[z] A certain tribe, called DERUSI, or DRUSI, who inhabit the recesses of the mounts *Liban* and *Antiliban*, pretend to descend from the ancient Franks, who were once masters of *Palestine*. This derivation is, indeed, doubtful. It is, however, certain, that there still remain in these countries descendents of those, whom the Holy war brought from *Europe* into *Palestine*; though they do very little honour to their ancestors, and have nothing of Christians but the name.

looked

looked upon as the very essence of right reason, contributed much to support this delusion, and to nourish a proud and presumptuous spirit of infidelity. This quibbling and intricate philosophy led many to reject some of the most evident and important doctrines both of natural and revealed religion, such as the doctrine of a divine providence governing the universe, the immortality of the soul, the scripture account of the origin of the world, and other points of less moment. These doctrines were not only rejected, but the most pernicious errors were industriously propagated in opposition to them, by a set of Aristotelians, who were extremely active in gaining proselytes to their impious jargon [a].

[a] See STI. THOMÆ *Summa contra gentes*, and BERNHARDI MONETÆ *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses*. This latter writer, in the work now mentioned, combats, with great spirit, the enemies of Christianity which appeared in his time. In the fourth chapter of the fifth book, p. 416. he disputes, in an ample and copious manner, against those who affirmed, *that the soul perished with the body*, refutes, in the eleventh chapter, p. 477. those Aristotelian philosophers, who held, that the world had existed from all eternity, and would never have an end; and, in the fifteenth chapter, p. 554. he attacks those, who despising the authority of the sacred writings, deny the existence of *human liberty*, and maintain, that all things, and even the crimes of the wicked are the effects of an *absolute and irresistible necessity*. Add to these authors, STEPHANI TEMPIERII, *Episcopi Parisiensis*, *Indiculus errorum, qui a nonnullis Magistris Lutetiæ publice privatimque docebantur*, Anno 1277, in *Bibliotheca patrum Maxima*, tom. xxv. p. 233. as also BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 433. and GERARDI DU BOTS, *Hist. Eccles. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 501. The tenets of these doctors will, no doubt, appear of a surprizing nature; for they taught, *that there was only one intellect among all the human race; that all things were subject to absolute fate or necessity; that the universe was not governed by a divine providence; that the world was eternal, and the soul mortal; and they maintained these and such like monstrous errors by arguments drawn from the philosophy of ARISTOTLE*. But, at the same time, to avoid the just resentment of the people, they held up, as a buckler against their adversaries, that most dangerous and pernicious distinction between *theological and philosophical truth*, which has been since used, with the utmost cunning and bad faith, by the more recent Aristotelians of the xv and xvith centuries. *These things, said they (as we learn from STEPHEN TAMPIER) are true in philosophy, but not according to the catholic faith. Vera sunt hæc secundum philosophum, non secundum fidem catholicam.*

CENT.
XIII.Frederic II
accused of
impiety.

III. If the accusations brought against FREDERIC II, by the Roman pontiff GREGORY IX, deserve any credit, that prince may be ranked among the most inveterate and malignant enemies of the Christian religion, since he was charged by GREGORY with having said, that *the world had been deceived by three impostors, MOSES, CHRIST, and MAHOMET* [b]. This charge was answered by a solemn and public profession of his faith, which the emperor addressed to all the kings and princes of *Europe*, to whom also had been addressed the accusation brought against him by the pontiff. The accusation, however, was founded upon the testimony of HENRY RASPON, landgrave of *Thuringia*, who declared that he had heard the emperor pronounce the abominable blasphemy above mentioned [c]. It is, after all, difficult to decide with sufficient evidence concerning the truth of this fact. FREDERIC, who was extremely passionate and imprudent, may, perhaps in a fit of rage, have let some such expression as this escape his reflexion, and this is rendered probable enough by the company he frequented, and the number of learned Aristotelians that were always about his person, and might suggest matter enough for such impious expressions, as that now under consideration. It was this affair that gave occasion, in after times, to the invention of that fabulous account, which supposes the detestable book *Concerning the three impostors*, to have been composed by the emperor himself, or, by PETER DE VINEIS, a native of *Capua*, a man of great credit and authority, whom that prince had chosen for his prime minister, and in whom he placed the highest confidence [d].

[b] MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major*, p. 408. 459.—PETR. DE VINEIS, *Epistolarum Lib. i.*

[c] HERM. GYGANTIS, *Floris temporum*, p. 126. — CHR. FRID. AYRMANN, *Sylloge Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 639.

[d] See CASIM. OUDINI *Comment. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, tom. iii. p. 66.—ALB. HENR. DE SALLENGRE, *Memoires d'Histoire et de Litterature*, tom. i. part. I. p. 386.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of learning and philosophy during this century.

I. **T**HE Greeks, amidst the dreadful calamities, discords, and revolutions, that distracted and perplexed their unhappy country, had neither that spirit, nor that leisure that are necessary to the culture of the arts and sciences. Yet, under all these disadvantages, they still retained a certain portion of their former spirit, and did not intirely abandon the cause of learning and philosophy, as appear by the writers that arose among them during this century. Their best historians were NICETAS CHONIATES, GEORGIUS ACROPOLITA, GREGORIUS PACHYMERES, and JOEL, whose *Chronology* is yet extant. We learn from the writings of GREGORY PACHYMERES and NICEPHORUS BLEMMI-DA, that the Peripatetic philosophy was not without its admirers among the Greeks; though the Platonic was most in vogue. The greatest part of the Grecian philosophers, following the example of the later Platonists, whose works were the subject of their constant meditation, inclined to reduce the wisdom of PLATO, and the subtilties of the Stagirite into one system, and to reconcile, as well as they could, their jarring principles. It is not necessary to exhibit a list of those authors, who wrote the lives and discourses of the saints, or distinguished themselves in the controversy with the Latin church, or of those who employed their learned labours in illustrating the canon law of the Greeks. The principal Syrian writer, which this century produced,

C E N T.
XIII.

The state of
learning a-
mong the
Greeks.

CENT.
XIII.

ced, was GREGORY ABUL FARAI, primate of the Jacobites, a man of true genius and universal learning, who was a judicious divine, an eminent historian, and a good philosopher [a]. GEORGE ELMACIN, who composed the history of the Saracens was also a writer of no mean reputation.

The progress
of learning in
the west.

II. The sciences carried a fair aspect in the western world, where every branch of erudition was cultivated with assiduity and zeal, and, of consequence, flourished, with encreasing vigour, from day to day. The European kings and princes had learned, by a happy experience, how much the advancement of learning and arts contribute to the grandeur and happiness of a nation; and therefore they invited into their dominions learned men from all parts of the world, nourished the arts in their bosom, excited the youth to the love of letters, by crowning their progress with the most noble rewards, and encouraged every effort of genius by conferring upon such as excelled the most honourable distinctions. Among these patrons and pro-

[a] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article ABULPHARAGE; as also JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. cap. xlii. p. 244.

[ABULPHARAGIUS, or ABUL-FARAI, was a native of *Malatia*, a city in *Armenia*, near the source of the river *Euphrates*, and acquired a vast reputation in the east on account of his extensive erudition. He composed *An Abridgment of the Universal History*, from the beginning of the world to his own times, which he divided into ten parts, or dynasties. The 1st, comprehends the history of the ancient Patriarchs, from *Adam* to *Moses*. The 2^d, that of *Josbua* and the other Judges of *Israel*. The 3, 4, 5, and 6th, contain the history of the Kings of *Israel*, of the Chaldean Princes, of the Persian Magi, and of the Grecian Monarchs. The 7th, relates to the Roman history; the 8th, to that of the Greek Emperors of *Constantinople*. In the 9th, he treats concerning the Moguls. He is more to be depended upon in his history of the Saracens and Tartars, than in his accounts of other nations. The learned Dr. EDWARD POCKOCK translated this work into Latin, and published his translation in 1663; together with a Supplement, which carries on the history of the Oriental Princes, where ABUL-FARAI left it. The same learned translator had obliged the public, in 1650, with an abridgment of the ninth dynasty under the following title: *Specimen Historiæ Arabum; sive Georgii Abulfaragii Malatiensis de origine et moribus Arabum succincta narratio.*]

rectors

ectors of learning, the emperor FREDERIC II, and AL-
PHONSUS X, king of *Leon* and *Castile*, two princes as
much distinguished by their own learning, as by the
encouragement they granted to men of genius, acquir-
ed the highest renown, and rendered their names im-
mortal. The former founded the academy of *Naples*,
had the works of ARISTOTLE translated into Latin, as-
sembled about his person all the learned men, whom he
could engage by his munificence to repair to his
court, and gave many other undoubted proofs of his
zeal for the advancement of the arts and sciences [b].
The latter obtained an illustrious and permanent re-
nown by several learned productions, but more especial-
ly by his famous *Astronomical Tables* [c]. In conse-
quence then of the protection that was given to the
sciences in this century, academies were erected almost
in every city, peculiar privileges of various kinds were
also granted to the youth that frequented them, and
these learned societies acquired, at length, the form
of political bodies; that is to say, they were invested
with a certain jurisdiction, and were governed by their
own laws and statutes.

III. In the public schools or academies that were
founded at *Padua*, *Modena*, *Naples*, *Capua*, *Tbolouse*,
Salamanca, *Lions*, and *Cologne*, the whole circle of the
sciences was not taught, as in our times. The application
of the youth, and the labours of their instructors were
limited to certain branches of learning, and thus the
course of academical education remained imperfect.
The academy of *Paris*, which surpassed all the rest both
with respect to the number and abilities of its professors,
and the multitude of students by whom it was frequent-
ed, was the first learned society which extended the
sphere of education, received all the sciences into its
bosom, and appointed masters for every branch of eru-

The state of
the Euro-
pean acade-
mies.

[b] BOULAY. *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 115.—GIANNONE, *Hist. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 497. add to these the observations of JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 618.

[c] NIC. ANTONII *Bibliotheca vetus Hispan.* lib. viii. c. v. p. 217.
—JO. DE FERRERAS, *Histoire d'Espagne*, tom. iv. p. 347.

CENT.
XIII.

dition. Hence it was distinguished, before any other academy, with the title of an UNIVERSITY, to denote its embracing the whole circle of science, and, in process of time, other schools of learning were ambitious of forming themselves upon the same model, and of being honoured with the same title. In this famous university the doctors were divided into four colleges or classes, according to the branches of learning they professed; and these classes were called, in after-times, *faculties*. In each of these *faculties* a doctor was chosen by the suffrages of his colleagues, to preside during a fixed period in the society, and the title of *dean* was given to those, who successively filled that eminent office [d]. The head of the *university*, whose inspection and jurisdiction extended to all the branches of that learned body, was dignified with the name of *chancellor*, and that high and honourable place was filled by the bishop of *Paris*, to whom an assistant was afterwards joined, who shared the administration with him, and was clothed with an extensive authority [e]. The college set apart for the study of divinity was erected and endowed, in the year 1250, by an opulent and pious man, whose name was ROBERT DE SORBONNE, a particular friend and favourite of St. LEWIS, whose name was adopted, and is still retained by that theological society [f].

The academical course.

IV. Such as were desirous of being admitted professors in any of the *faculties*, or colleges of this famous university, were obliged to submit to a long and tedious *course* of probation, to suffer the strictest examinations,

[d] This arrangement was executed about the year 1260. See DU BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 557. 564.

[e] See HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquitates Academicæ*, a work, however, susceptible of considerable improvements. The important work mentioned in the preceding note, and which is divided into six volumes, deserves to be principally consulted in this point, as well as in all others that relate to the history and government of the university of *Paris*; add to this CLAUD. HEMERÆI *Liber de Academia Parisensi, qualis primo fuit in insula et episcoporum scholis.* Lutet. 1637, in 4to

[f] See DU BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 223.—DU FRESNE's *Annotations upon the Life of St. Lewis*, written by JOINVILLE, p. 36.

and

and to give, during several years, undoubted proofs of their learning and capacity, before they were received in the character of public teachers. This severe discipline was called the *academical course*, and it was wisely designed to prevent the number of professors from multiplying beyond measure, and also to hinder such as were destitute of erudition and abilities from assuming an office, which was justly looked upon as of high importance. They, who had satisfied all the demands of this academical law, and had gone through the formidable trial with applause, were solemnly invested with the dignity of *professors*, and were saluted *masters* with a certain round of ceremonies, that were used in the societies of illiterate tradesmen, when their company was augmented by a new candidate. This vulgar custom was introduced, in the preceding century, by the professors of law in the academy of *Bolonia*, and, in this century, it was transmitted to that of *Paris*, where it was first practised by the divinity-colleges, and afterwards by the professors of physic and of the liberal arts. In this account of the trial and installation of the professors of *Paris*, we may perceive the origin of what we now call *academical degrees*, which, like all other human institutions, have degenerated sadly from the wise end for which they were first appointed, and grow more insignificant from day to day [g].

V. These public institutions, consecrated to the advancement of learning, were attended with remarkable success; but that branch of erudition, which we call humanity, or polite literature, derived less advantage from them, than the other sciences. The industrious youth either applied themselves entirely to the study of the civil and canon laws, which was a sure path to preferment, or employed their labours in philosophical researches, in order to the attainment of a shining reputation.

The state of
literature or
humanity.

[g] Besides the writers above-mentioned, see JO. CHR. ITTERUS, *De Gradibus Academicis* — JUST. HENN. BÖHMERT *Præf. ad jus Canonicum*, p. 14. — ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 24. — BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 256. 682. 684, &c.

CENT.
XIII.

on, and of the applause that was lavished upon such as were endowed with a subtle and metaphysical genius. Hence the bitter complaints, that were made by the pontiffs and other bishops, of the neglect and decline of the liberal arts and sciences; and hence also the zealous, but unsuccessful efforts they used to turn the youth from jurisprudence and philosophy, to the study of humanity and philology [b]. Notwithstanding all this, the XIIIth century produced several writers, who were very far from being contemptible, such as GUIL. BRITO [i], GUALTHERUS MAPES [k], MATTHEW of *Vendosme*, ALAIN DE L'ISLE [l], GUNTHERUS, JACOBUS DE VITRIACO, and several others, who wrote with ease, and were not altogether destitute of elegance. Among the historians the first place is due to MATTHEW PARIS, a writer of the highest merit both in point of knowledge and prudence, to whom we may add RODERICUS XIMENIUS, RIGORDUS [m], VINCENT of *Beauvais*, ROBERT of *St. Marino* [n], MARTINUS, a native of *Poland*, GERVAIS of *Tilbury* [o], CONRAD of *Lichtenau*, GUILIELMUS NANGIUS, whose names are worthy of being preserved from oblivion. The writers, who have laboured to transmit to posterity the lives and exploits of

[b] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 265. where there is an epistle of INNOCENT III, who seems to take this matter seriously to heart.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 124.—IMOLA in *Dantem in Muratorii Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1262.

(i) See the *Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xvi. p. 255.

[k] Jo. WOLFII *Lectiones Memorabil.* tom. i. p. 430.

[l] Called in Latin, ALANUS *De insulis*.

[m] *Histoire de l'Acad. des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xvi. p. 243. which also gives an ample account of WILLIAM of *Nangis*, p. 292.

[n] See LE BOEUF, *Memoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 490. where there is also a learned account of VINCENT of *Beauvais*, p. 494.

[(o) JERVAIS of *Tilbury*, was nephew to HENRY II king of *England*, and was in high credit with the emperor OTHO IV, to whom he dedicated a Description of the World and a Chronicle, both of which he had himself composed. He wrote also a History of *England*, and one of the Holy Land, with several treatises upon different subjects.]

the

the saints, have rather related the superstitions and miseries of the times, than the actions of these holy men. Among these biographers, JAMES of Vitri, mentioned above, makes the greatest figure; he also composed a *History of the Lombards*, that is full of insipid and trifling stories [p].

VI. ROGER BACON [q], JOHN BALBI, and ROBERT CAPITO, with some other learned men, whose number was but inconsiderable, applied themselves to the study of Greek literature. The Hebrew language and theology were much less cultivated; though it appears that BACON and CAPITO already mentioned, and RAYMOND MARTIN, author of an excellent treatise, entitled, *Pugio Fidei Christianæ*, or, *The Dagger of the Christian Faith*, were extremely well versed in that species of erudition. Many of the Spaniards, and more particularly the Dominican friars, made themselves masters of the Arabian learning and language, as the kings of Spain had charged the latter with the instruction and conversion of the Jews and Saracens who resided in their dominions [r]. As to the Latin grammarians, the best of them were extremely barbarous and insipid, and equally destitute of taste and knowledge. To be convinced of this, we have only to cast an eye upon the productions of ALEXANDER DE VILLA DEI, who was looked upon as

The study of
the Greek
and Oriental
languages.

[p] See SCHELHORNII *Amœnitates Litterariæ*, tom. xi. p. 324.

[q] This illustrious Franciscan was, in point of genius and universal learning, one of the greatest ornaments of the British nation, and in general of the republic of letters. The astonishing discoveries he made in astronomy, chemistry, optics, and mathematics, made him pass for a magician in the ignorant and superstitious times in which he lived, while his profound knowledge in philosophy, theology, and the Greek and Oriental languages, procured him, with more justice, the title of the *admirable*, or *wonderful doctor*. Among other discoveries, he is said to have made that of the composition and force of gun-powder, which he describes clearly in one of his letters; and he proposed much the same correction of the Kalendar, which was executed about 300 years after by GREGORY XIII. He composed a prodigious number of books, of which the list may be seen in the *General Dictionary*, at the article BACON.]

[r] See RICH. SIMON'S *Lettres Choïsies*, tom. iii. p. 112.—NIC. ANTONII *Bibliotheca veter. Hispanica*.

CENT. the most eminent of them all, and whose works were
 XIII. read in almost all the schools from this period until the
 xvth century. This pedantic Franciscan composed, in
 the year 1240, what he called, a *Doctrinale*, in Leonine
 verse, full of the most wretched quibbles, and in which
 the rules of grammar and criticism are delivered with the
 greatest confusion and obscurity, or rather, are covered
 with impenetrable darkness.

The state of
 philosophy.

VII. The various systems of philosophy that were in
 vogue before this century, lost their credit by degrees,
 and submitted to the triumphant doctrine of ARISTOTLE,
 which erected a new and despotic empire in the repub-
 lic of letters, and reduced the whole ideal world under
 its lordly dominion. Several of the works of this phi-
 losopher, and more especially his metaphysical produc-
 tions, had been so early as the beginning of this centu-
 ry translated into Latin at *Paris*, and were from that
 time explained to the youth in the public schools [s].
 But when it appeared, that ALMERIC [t] had drawn
 from these books his erroneous sentiments concerning
 the divine nature, they were prohibited and condemn-
 ed as pernicious and pestilential by a public decree of

[s] FRANC. PATRICII *Discussiones Peripateticæ*, tom. i. lib. xi. p. 145.
 —JO. LAUNOIUS, *De varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Parisensi*, cap. i.
 p. 127. ed. *Elfwich*. It is commonly reported, that the books of ARIS-
 TOTLE here mentioned were translated from Arabic into Latin. But we
 are told positively, that these books were brought from *Constantinople*,
 and translated from Greek into Latin. See RIGORDUS, *De gestis Phi-*
lippi regis Francorum, ad A. 1209, in ANDR. CHESNII *Scriptor. Histor.*
Franc. p. 119

[(t) ALMERIC, or AMAURI, does not seem to have entertained any
 enormous errors. He held, that every Christian was obliged to believe
 himself a member of JESUS CHRIST, and attached, perhaps, some
 extravagant and fanatical ideas to that opinion; but his followers fell in-
 to more pernicious notions, and adopted the most odious tenets, main-
 taining, that the power of the Father continued no longer than the Mo-
 saic dispensation; that the empire of the son extended only to the xiiith
 century; and that then the reign of the Holy Ghost commenced, when
 all sacraments and external worship were to be abolished, and the salva-
 tion of Christians was to be accomplished merely by internal acts of illu-
 minating grace. Their morals also were as infamous, as their doctrine
 was absurd, and under the name of charity they comprehended and
 committed the most criminal acts of impurity and licentiousness.]

the council of *Sens* in the year 1209 [u]. The logic of ARISTOTLE, however, recovered its credit some years after this, and was publicly taught, in the university of *Paris* in the year 1215; but the natural philosophy and metaphysic of that great man were still under the sentence of condemnation [w]. It was reserved for the emperor FREDERIC II, to restore the Stagirite to his former glory, which this prince effected by employing a number of learned men, whom he had chosen with the greatest attention and care [x], and who were profoundly versed in the knowledge of the languages, to translate into Latin from the Greek and Arabic, certain books of ARISTOTLE, and of other ancient sages. This translation, which was recommended, in a particular manner, to the academy of *Bolonia* by the learned emperor, raised the credit of ARISTOTLE to the greatest height, and gave him an irresistible and despotic authority in all the European schools. This authority was still farther augmented by the translations, which were made of some of the books of the Grecian sage by several Latin interpreters, such as MICHAEL SCOT, PHILIP of *Tripoly*, WILLIAM FLEMING, and others; though these men were quite unequal to the task they undertook, and had neither such knowledge of the languages, nor such an acquaintance with philosophy, as were necessary to

[u] Dr. MOSHEIM has fallen here into two slight mistakes. It was at *Paris*, and not at *Sens*, and in the year 1210, and not in 1209, that the metaphysical books of ARISTOTLE were condemned to the flames. The writers quoted here by our author are LAUNOIUS, *De varia Aristotelis fortuna in Acad. Paris.* cap. iv. p. 195. and the same writer's *Syllabus rationum quibus Durandi causa defenditur*, tom. i. Opp. part. I. p. 8.]

[w] NAT. ALEXANDER, *Select. Histor. Eccles. Capita*, tom. viii. cap. iii. § 7. p. 76.

[x] PETR. DE VINEIS *Epistolar. Lib. iii. Ep. lxxvii.* p. 503. This epistle is addressed *ad magistros et scholares Bononienses*, i. e. to the masters and scholars of the academy of *Bolonia*; but it is more than probable, that the emperor sent letters, upon this occasion, to the other European schools. It is the common opinion, that this learned prince had all the works of ARISTOTLE, that were then extant, translated into Latin about the year 1220, but this cannot be deduced from the letter above mentioned, nor from any other sufficient testimony that we know of.

the

CENT.
XIII.

Thomas A.
quinas and
others adopt
and maintain
the Aristote-
lian system.

the successful execution of such a difficult enterprize [y].

VIII. The Aristotelian philosophy received the very last addition that could be made to its authority and lustre; when the Dominican and Franciscan friars adopted its tenets, taught it in their schools, and illustrated it in their writings. These two mendicant orders were looked upon as the chief depositaries of all learning both human and divine, and were followed, with the utmost eagerness and assiduity, by all such as were ambitious of being distinguished from the multitude by their superior knowledge. ALEXANDER HALES, an English Franciscan, who taught philosophy at *Paris*, and acquired, by the strength of his metaphysical genius, the title of the IRREFRAGABLE *Doctor* [z]. and ALBERT the Great, a German, of the Dominican order, and bishop of *Ratisbon*, a man of vast abilities and a universal dictator at this time [a], were the two first eminent writers who illustrated, in their learned productions, the Aristotelian system. But it was the disciple of ALBERT, THOMAS AQUINAS, the *Angelic doctor*, and the great luminary of the scholastic world, that contributed most to the glory of the Stagirite [b], by inculcating, illus-

[y] See WOOD's account of the interpreters of ARISTOTLE, in his *Antiquitat. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 119. as also JEBB's *Preface* to the *Opus Majus* of the famous ROGER BACON, published at *London* in folio, in the year 1733. We shall give here the opinion, which BACON had of the translators of ARISTOTLE, in the words of that great man, who expresses his contempt of these wretched interpreters in the following manner: *Si haberem (says he) potestatem supra libros Aristotelis Latine converteres, ego facerem omnes cremari, quia non est nisi temporis amisso studere in illis, et causa erroris et multiplicatio ignorantiae, ultra id quod valeat explicari.*

[z] See LUCÆ WADDINGI *Annales Minorum*, tom. iii. p. 233.—DU BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 200. 673.

[a] JO. ALB. FABRICII *Bibliotheca Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 113.

[b] The Dominicans maintain, that this *Angelic Doctor* was the disciple of ALBERT the Great, and their opinion seems to be founded on truth. See ANTOINE TOURON, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 99. The Franciscans, however, maintain as obstinately, that ALEXANDER HALES was the master of THOMAS. See WADDINGI *Annales Minorum*, tom. iii. p. 133.

trating

trating, and enforcing his doctrines, both in his lectures and in his writings, and, principally, by engaging one of his learned colleagues to give, under his inspection, a new translation of the works of the Grecian sage, which far surpassed the former version in exactness, perspicuity, and elegance [c]. By these means the philosophy of ARISTOTLE, notwithstanding the opposition of several divines, and even of the Roman pontiffs themselves, who beheld its progress with an unfriendly eye, triumphed in all the Latin schools, and absorbed all the other systems that had flourished before this literary revolution.

IX. There were, however, at this time in Europe several persons of superior genius and penetration, who notwithstanding their veneration for ARISTOTLE, thought the method of treating philosophy, which his writings had introduced, dry, inelegant, and proper to confine and damp the efforts of the mind in the pursuit of truth, and who, consequently, were desirous of enlarging the sphere of science by new researches and new discoveries [d]. At the head of these noble adventurers

The limits of science are extended by several eminent men.

we

[c] It has been believed by many, that WILLIAM DE MOERBEKA, a native of Flanders, of the Dominican order, and archbishop of Corinth, was the author of the new Latin translation of the Works of ARISTOTLE, which was carried on and finished under the auspicious inspection of THOMAS AQUINAS. See J. ECHARD *Scriptores Dominican.* tom. i. p. 338.—CASIM. OUDINUS, *Comm. de Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. iii. p. 468.—JO. FRANC. FOPPENS, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, tom. i. p. 416. Others however suppose, though indeed with less evidence, that this translation was composed by HENRY KOSBEIN, who was also a Dominican. See ECHARD *Script. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 469.

[d] BACON'S contempt of the learning that was in vogue in his time may be seen in the following passage quoted by JEBB, in his *Preface* to the *Opus Majus* of that great man. *Nunquam, says he, fuit tanta apparentia sapientiæ, nec tantum exercitium studii in tot facultatibus, in tot regionibus, sicut jam a quadraginta annis; ubique enim doctores sunt dispersi... in omni civitate, et in omni castro, et in omni burgo, præcipue per duos ordines studentes* (he means the Franciscans and Dominicans, who were almost the only religious orders, that distinguished themselves by an application to study) *quod non accidit, nisi a quadraginta annis aut circiter, cum tamen nunquam fuit TANTA IGNORANTIA, TANTUS ERROR... Vulgus studentium languet et asininat circa male translata* (by these wretched

CENT.
XIII.

we may justly place ROGER BACON, a Franciscan friar, of the English nation, known by the appellation of the *admirable doctor*, renowned on account of his most important discoveries, and who, in the progress he had made in natural philosophy, mathematics, chemistry, the mechanic arts, and the learned languages, soared far beyond the genius of the times [e]. With him we may associate ARNOLD of *Villa nova*, whose place of nativity is fixed by some in *France*, by others in *Spain*, and who acquired a shining reputation by his knowledge in chemistry, poetry, philosophy, languages, and physic [f]; as also PETRUS DE ABANO, a physician of *Padua*, who was surnamed the *Reconciler*, from a book he wrote with a design to terminate the dissensions and contests that reigned among the philosophers and physicians [g], and who was profoundly versed in the sciences of philosophy, astronomy, physic, and mathematics [h]. It must,

wretched versions he understands the works of ARISTOTLE, which were most miserably translated by ignorant bunglers) *et tempus et studium amittit in omnibus et expensas. Apparentia quidem sola tenet eos, et non curant quid sciant, sed quid videantur scire coram multitudine insensata.* Thus, according to BACON, in the midst of the most specious appearance of science, the greatest ignorance, and the grossest errors reigned almost universally.

[e] That BACON deserves this high rank in the learned world appears evidently from his book, entitled, *Opus Majus*, which was dedicated to the Roman pontiff CLEMENT IV, and which Doctor JEBB published at *London* in 1733, from a manuscript which still exists in the university of *Dublin*, enriching it with a learned Preface and a considerable number of judicious observations. The other works of BACON, which are very numerous, lie as yet for the most part concealed in the libraries of the curious. For a farther account of this eminent man, see WOOD *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 136.—WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 264. tom. v. p. 51.—THOM. GALE *ad Jamblichum de Mysteriis Egyptior.* p. 235. *General Hist. and Crit. Dictionary*, at the article BACON.

[f] See NIC. ANTONII *Biblioth. vetus Hispan.* tom. ii. lib. ix. c. i. p. 74.—PIERRE JOSEPH, *Vie d'Arnaud de Ville neuve*, Aix 1719.—NICERON, *Memoires des hommes illustres*, tom. xxxiv. p. 82.—NICOL. EYMERICI *Directorium Inquisitorum*, p. 282. where among other things we have an account of his errors.

[g] This book was entitled, *Conciliator Differentiarum Philosophorum et Medicorum.*

[h] There is a very accurate account of this philosopher given by JOHN, MARIA

must, however, be observed to the eternal dishonour of the age, that the only fruits, which these great men enjoyed of their learned labours, and their noble, as well as successful, efforts for the advancement of the arts and sciences, were the furious clamours of an enraged and superstitious multitude, who looked upon them as heretics and magicians, and thirsted so eagerly after their blood, that they escaped, with difficulty, the hands of the public executioner. BACON was confined many years in a loathsome prison, and the other two were, after their death, brought before the tribunal of the inquisition, and declared worthy of being committed to the flames for the novelties they had introduced into the republic of letters.

X. The state of theology, and the method of teaching and representing the doctrines of Christianity that now prevailed, shall be mentioned in their place. The civil and canon laws held the first rank in the circle of the sciences, and were studied with a peculiar zeal and application by almost all who were ambitious of literary glory. These sciences, however, notwithstanding the assiduity with which they were cultivated, were far from being, as yet, brought to any tolerable degree of perfection. They were disfigured by the jargon that reigned in the schools, and they were corrupted and rendered intricate by a multitude of trivial commentaries that were designed to illustrate and explain them. Some employed their labours in collecting the letters of the Roman pontiffs, which were commonly known under the title of *Decretals* [i], and which were looked upon as a very important branch of ecclesiastical law. RAIMOND of *Pennafort*, a native of *Barcelona*, was the most famous of all these compilers, and acquired a considerable reputation by his collection of the *Decretals* in five books, which he undertook at the desire of GREGORY IX, and which has been since honoured with the name

The study of
law and phy-
sic.

MARIA MAZZUCHELLI *Notizie Storiche e Critiche intorno alla vita di Pietro d'Abano*, in ANGELI CALOGERA *Opusculi Scientifici et Philologici*, tom. xxiii. p. i.—liv.

[i] See BOULAY, *Hist. Academ. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 98.

of

CENT.
XIII.

of that pontiff, who ordered it to be added to the Decretals of GRATIAN, and to be read in all the European colleges [k]. Towards the conclusion of this century, BONIFACE VIII had a new collection made, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of Decretals*, because it was added to the five already mentioned.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its form of government during this century.

The corrup-
tion of the
clergy,

I. BOTH the Greek and Latin writers, provoked, beyond measure, by the flagitious lives of their spiritual rulers and instructors, complain loudly of their licentious manners, and load them with the severest reproaches; nor will these complaints and reproaches appear excessive to such as are acquainted with the history of this corrupt and superstitious age [l]. Several eminent men attempted to stem this torrent of licentiousness, which from the heads of the church had carried its pernicious streams through all the members; but their power and influence were unequal to such a difficult and arduous enterprize. The Grecian emperors were prevented from executing any project of this kind by the infelicity of the times, and the various calamities and tumults that not only reigned in their dominions, but even shook the throne on which they sat; while the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs and the superstition of the age hindered the Latins from ac-

[k] GERH. a MASTRICHT, *Historia juris Ecclesiastici*, § 353, p. 384.—JO. CHIFLET, *De juris utriusque Architectis*, cap. vi. p. 60.—ECHARD et QUETIF, *Scriptores Dominici*, tom. i. p. 106.—*Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp. tom. i. Januarii add. vii. p. 404.

[l] See the remarkable letter of the Roman pontiff GREGORY IX to the archbishop of Bourges, which was written in the year 1227, with a design to reprove and reform the vices which had infested all the various orders of the clergy, and which is published by DION. SAMMARTHANUS, in his *Gallia Christiana*. tom. ii. in *Append.* p. 21.—See also DU FRESNE, *Adnotat. in Vitam Ludovici Sti.* p. 99.

completing

completing, or even attempting a reformation in the C E N T.
church. XIII.

II. The history of the popes presents a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that dishonoured the ministers of the church, who were peculiarly obliged, by their sacred office, to exhibit to the world distinguished models of piety and virtue. Such of the Sacerdotal order, as were advanced to places of authority in the church, behaved rather like tyrants than rulers, and shewed manifestly, in all their conduct, that they aimed at an absolute and unlimited dominion. The popes, more especially, inculcated that pernicious maxim, "That the bishop of *Rome* is the supreme lord of the universe, and that neither princes nor bishops, civil governors, nor ecclesiastical rulers, have any lawful power in church or state but what they derive from him." This abominable maxim, which was considered as the sum and substance of papal jurisprudence, the Roman pontiffs maintained obstinately, and left no means unemployed, that perfidy or violence could suggest, to give it the force of an universal law. It was in consequence of this arrogant pretension, that they not only claimed the right of disposing of ecclesiastical *benefices*, as they are commonly called, but also of conferring civil dominion and of dethroning kings and emperors according to their good pleasure. It is true, this maxim was far from being universally adopted; many placed the authority of councils above that of the pontiffs, and such of the European kings and princes as were not ingloriously blinded, and enslaved by the superstition of the times, asserted their rights with dignity and success, excluded the pontiffs from all concern in their civil transactions, nay, even reserved to themselves the supremacy over the churches that were established in their dominions [m]. In opposing thus
the

And of the
Roman pontiffs.

[m] As a specimen of this the reader may peruse the letters of INNOCENT III, and the emperor OTHO IV, which have been collected by the learned GEORGE CHRIST. GEBAUER, in his *History of the Empe-*

CENT. the haughty pretensions of the lordly pontiffs, it was, indeed, necessary to proceed with mildness, caution, and prudence, on account of the influence which these spiritual tyrants had usurped over the minds of the people, and the power they had of alarming princes, by exciting their subjects to rebellion.

The power
of creating
bishops, ab-
bots, &c.
claimed by
the pontiffs.

XIII. III. In order to establish their authority, both in civil and ecclesiastical matters, upon the firmest foundations, the Roman pontiffs assumed to themselves the power of disposing of the various offices of the church, whether of a higher or more subordinate nature, and of creating *bishops, abbots, and canons* according to their fancy. Thus we see the ghostly heads of the church, who formerly disputed with such ardor against the emperors in favour of the free election of bishops and abbots, overturning now all the laws that related to the election of these spiritual rulers, reserving for themselves the revenues of the richest benefices, conferring vacant places upon their clients and their creatures, nay, often deposing bishops that had been duly and lawfully elected, and substituting, with a high hand, others in their room [n]. The hypocritical pretexts for all these arbitrary proceedings were an ardent zeal for the welfare of the church, and an anxious concern, lest devouring *heretics* should get a footing among the flock of CHRIST [o]. The first of the pontiffs who usurped such an extravagant extent of authority, was INNOCENT III, whose example was followed by HONORIUS III, GREGORY IX, and several of their successors. But it was keenly opposed by the bishops, who had hitherto enjoyed the privilege of nominating to the smaller benefices, and, still more error RICHARD, written in Germany, p. 611.—614. Other princes, and more especially the kings of *England* and *France* displayed, in the defence of their rights and privileges, the same zeal that animated OTHO.

[n] Many examples of this may be taken from the history of this century. See STEPH. BALUZII *Miscellan*, tom. vii. p. 443. 466. 470. 488. 491. 493.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 69. *Append.*—LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor. in Diplom.*—WOOD *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 148. 201. 202.

[o] See the *Epistle* of INNOCENT IV, in BALUZ. *Miscellan.* tom. vii. p. 468.

fectually,

this expedition, promising such as seconded PHILIP in this grand enterprize the same indulgences that were granted to those who carried arms against the infidels in *Palestine*. The French monarch entered into the views of the Roman pontiff, and made immense preparations for the invasion of *England*. The king of *England*, on the other hand, assembled his forces, and was putting himself in a posture of defence, when PANDULF, the pope's legate, arrived at *Dover*, and proposed a conference in order to prevent the approaching rupture, and to avert the storm. This artful legate terrified the king, who met him at that place, with an exaggerated account of the armament of PHILIP on the one hand, and of the disaffection of the English on the other; and persuaded him that there was no possible way left of saving his dominions from the formidable arms of the French king, but that of putting them under the protection of the Roman see. JOHN, finding himself in such a perplexing situation, and full of diffidence both in the nobles of his court and in the officers of his army, complied with this dishonourable proposal, did homage to INNOCENT, resigned his crown to the legate, and received it again as a present from the see of *Rome*, to which he rendered his kingdoms tributary, and swore fealty as a vassal and feudatory [f]. In the act by which he resigned, thus scandalously, his kingdoms to the papal jurisdiction, he declared that he had neither been compelled to this measure by fear nor by force, but that it was his own voluntary deed, performed by the advice, and with the consent of the barons of his kingdom. He obliged himself and his heirs to pay an annual sum of seven hundred marks for *England*, and three hundred for *Ireland*, in acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy and jurisdiction, and consented that he or such of his successors as should refuse to pay the submission, now stipulated, to the see of *Rome*, should

[f] For a full account of this shameful ceremony, see MATTHEW PARIS, *Historia Major*, p. 189. 192. 195. — As also BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii. p. 67. — RAPIN THOYRAS, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. p. 304.

CENT.
XIII.

forfeit all their right to the British crown [g]. " This
 " shameful ceremony was performed, says a modern
 " historian [b], on Ascension day in the house of the
 " Templars at *Dover*, in the midst of a great concourse
 " of people, who beheld it with confusion and indig-
 " nation. JOHN, in doing homage to the pope, pre-
 " sented a sum of money to his representative, which
 " the proud legate trampled under his feet, as a mark
 " of the king's dependence. Every spectator glowed
 " with resentment, and the archbishop of *Dublin* ex-
 " claimed aloud against such intolerable insolence.
 " PANDULF, not satisfied with this mortifying act of su-
 " periority, kept the crown and scepter five whole
 " days, and then restored them as a special favour of
 " the Roman see. JOHN was despised before this extra-
 " ordinary resignation; but now he was looked upon
 " as a contemptible wretch, unworthy to sit upon a
 " throne: while he himself seemed altogether insensi-
 " ble of his disgrace."

Honorius III.

IX. INNOCENT III was succeeded in the pontificate by
 CONCIO SAVELLI, who assumed the title of HONORIUS
 III, ruled the church above ten years, and whose go-
 vernment, though not signalized by such audacious ex-
 ploits as those of his predecessor, discovered, neverthe-
 less, an ardent zeal for maintaining the pretensions, and
 supporting the despotism of the Roman see. It was, in
 consequence of this zeal, that the new pontiff opposed
 the measures, and drew upon him the indignation of
 FREDERIC II, that magnanimous prince, on whose head
 he himself had placed, in the year 1220, the imperial
 crown. This spirited prince, following the steps of his
 illustrious grand-father, had formed the resolution of
 confirming the authority and extending the jurisdiction
 of the emperors in *Italy*, of depressing the small states
 of *Lombardy*, and reducing to narrower limits the im-

[(g) *Cadet a jure regni*, is the expression used in the *Charter of re-
 signation*, which may be seen at length in the *Hist. Major* of MAT-
 THEW PARIS.]

[(b) See the *Complete History of England*, by Dr. SMOLLET, vol. i. p.
 437.]

France, for having dissolved his marriage with INGERBURG, a princess of *Denmark*, and espoused another in her place; nor did he cease to pursue this monarch with his anathemas, until he engaged him to receive the divorced queen, and to restore her to her lost dignity [d].

VIII. But of all the European princes none felt, in so dishonourable and severe a manner, the despotic fury of this insolent pontiff as JOHN, surnamed *Sans terre*, king of *England*. This prince opposed vigorously the measures of INNOCENT, who had ordered the monks of *Canterbury* to chuse STEPHEN LANGTON, a Roman cardinal of English descent, archbishop of that see, notwithstanding the election of JOHN DE GREY to that high dignity which had been regularly made by the convent, and had been confirmed by royal authority [e]. The pope, after having consecrated LANGTON at *Viterbo*, wrote a soothing letter in his favour, to the king, accompanied with four rings, and a mystical comment upon the precious stones with which they were enriched. But this present was not sufficient to avert the just indignation of the offended monarch, who sent a body of troops to drive out of the kingdom the monks of *Canterbury*, who had been engaged by the pope's menaces to receive LANGTON as their archbishop. The king also declared to the pontiff, that, if he persisted in imposing a prelate upon the see of *Canterbury* in opposition to a regular election already made, the consequences of such presumptuous obstinacy would, in the issue, prove fatal to the papal authority in *England*. INNOCENT was so far

[d] BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris*. tom. iii. p. 8.—DANIEL, *Histoire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 475.—GERHARD. DU BOIS, *Histor. Eccles. Paris*. tom. ii. p. 204—257.

[e] Dr. MOSHEIM passes lightly over this rupture between king JOHN and INNOCENT III, mentioning in a few lines the interdict under which *Eng and* was laid by that pontiff, the excommunication he issued out against the king's person, and the impious act by which he absolved the English from their allegiance. The translator, however, thought this event of too great importance to be treated with such brevity, and has, therefore, taken the liberty to enlarge considerably this VIIIth section, which contains but eleven lines in the original.]

C E N T.
XIII.

from being terrified by this menacing remonstrance, that, in the year 1208, he sent orders to the bishops of *London, Worcester, and Ely* to lay the kingdom under an *interdict*, in case the monarch refused to yield and to receive *LANGTON*. *JOHN*, alarmed at this terrible menace, and unwilling to break entirely with the pope, declared his readiness to confirm the election made at *Rome*; but in the act that was drawn up for this purpose, he wisely threw in a clause to prevent any interpretation of this compliance, that might be prejudicial to his rights, dignity, and prerogative. This exception was rejected, and the *interdict* was proclaimed. A stop was immediately put to divine service; the churches were shut; the administration of all the sacraments was suspended except that of baptism; the dead were buried in the highways without the usual rites or any funeral solemnity. But notwithstanding this *interdict*, the Cistercian order continued to perform divine service, and several learned and respectable divines, among which were the bishops of *Winchester* and *Norwich*, protested against the injustice of the pope's proceedings.

The *interdict* not producing the effects that were expected from it, the pontiff proceeded to a still farther degree of severity and presumption, and denounced a sentence of excommunication against the person of the English monarch. This sentence, which was issued out in the year 1208, was followed about three years after by a bull, absolving all his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and ordering all persons to avoid him, on pain of excommunication. But it was in the year 1212, that *INNOCENT* carried his impious tyranny to the most enormous length, when, assembling a council of cardinals and prelates, he deposed *JOHN*, declared the throne of *England* vacant, and wrote to *PHILIP AUGUSTUS*, king of *France*, to execute this sentence, to undertake the conquest of *England*, and to unite that kingdom to his dominions for ever. He, at the same time, published another bull, exhorting all Christian princes to contribute, whatever was in their power, to the success of this

sessions to the Roman see [*x*], and confirmed the immense donation that had formerly been made to it by the opulent MATILDA. Such was the progress that INNOCENT III made during his pontificate, in augmenting the splendor and wealth of the church. NICOLAS IV followed his example with the warmest emulation, and, in the year 1278, gave a remarkable proof of his arrogance and obstinacy in refusing to crown the emperor RODOLPHUS I, before he had acknowledged and confirmed, by a solemn treaty, all the pretensions of the Roman see, of which, if some were plausible, the greatest part were altogether groundless, or, at least, extremely dubious. This agreement, to which all the Italian princes, that were subject to the emperor, were obliged to accede, was no sooner concluded, than NICOLAS reduced under his temporal dominion several cities, and territories in *Italy* that had formerly been annexed to the imperial crown, particularly *Romania* and *Bologna*. It was therefore under these two pontiffs, that the see of *Rome* arrived, partly by force, and partly by artifice, at that high degree of grandeur and opulence, which it yet maintains in our times [*y*].

VI. INNOCENT III, who remained at the head of the church until the year 1216, followed the steps of GREGORY VII, and not only usurped the despotic government of the church, but also claimed the empire of the world, and thought of nothing less than subjecting the kings and princes of the earth to his lordly scepter. He was a man of learning and application, but his cruelty, avarice, and arrogance [*z*] clouded the lustre of any good qualities, which his panegyrists have thought proper to attribute to him. In *Asia* and *Europe* he disposed of crowns and scepters with the most wanton ambition. In *Asia* he gave a king to the Armenians: in *Europe* he usurped the same extravagant privilege in the year 1204, and conferred the regal

The tyrannic pontificate of Innocent III, proved by several examples.

[*x*] ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad A. 1212. § ii.*

[*y*] See RAYNALDUS, *loc. cit. ad A. 1278. § xlvii.*

[*z*] See MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major, p. 206. 230.*

CENT.
XIII.

dignity upon PRIMISLAUS, duke of *Bohemia* [a]. The same year he sent to JOHANNICIUS, duke of *Bulgaria* and *Walachia*, an extraordinary legate, who, in the name of the pontiff, invested that prince with the ensigns and honours of royalty, while, with his own hand, he crowned PETER II of *Arragon*, who had rendered his dominions subject and tributary to the church, and saluted him publicly at *Rome* with the title of King [b]. We omit many other examples of this frenetic pretension to universal empire, which might be produced from the letters of this arrogant pontiff, and many other acts of despotism, which *Europe* beheld with astonishment, but also, to its eternal reproach, with the ignominious silence of a passive obedience.

VII. The ambition of this pope was not satisfied with the distribution and government of these petty kingdoms. He extended his views farther, and resolved to render the power and majesty of the Roman see formidable to the greatest European monarchs, and even to the emperors themselves. When the empire of *Germany* was disputed, towards the commencement of this century, between PHILIP, duke of *Suabia*, and OTHO IV, third son of HENRY LION, he espoused, at first, the cause of OTHO, thundered out his excommunications against PHILIP, and upon the death of the latter, which happened in the year 1209, he placed the imperial diadem upon the head of his adversary. But as OTHO was by no means disposed to submit to this pontiff's nod, or to satisfy, to the full, his ambitious desires, he incurred, of consequence, his lordly indignation, and INNOCENT, declaring him, by a solemn excommunication, unworthy of the empire, raised in his place FREDERIC II his pupil, the son of HENRY VI, and king of the two *Sicilies* to the imperial throne in the year 1712 [c]. The same pontiff excommunicated PHILIP AUGUSTUS, king of

[a] Other historians affirm, that it was the emperor PHILIP that conferred the royal dignity upon PRIMISLAUS, in order to strengthen his party against OTHO.]

[b] MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 116.—JO. DE FERRERA, *Histoire d'Espagne*, tom. iv. p. 8.

[c] All this is amply illustrated in the *Origines Guelphicæ*. tom. iii. lib. vii. p. 247.

France,

fectually, by the kings of *England* and *France*, who employed the force of warm remonstrances and vigorous edicts to stop the progress of this new jurisprudence [p]. LEWIS IX, king of *France*, and now the tutelar saint of that nation, distinguished himself by the noble opposition he made to these papal encroachments. In the year 1268, before he set out for the Holy Land, he secured the rights of the Gallican church against the insidious attempts of the Roman pontiffs by that famous edict known in *France* by the name of the *pragmatic sanction* [q]. This resolute and prudent measure rendered the pontiffs more cautious, and slow in their proceedings, but did not terrify them from the prosecution of their purpose. For BONIFACE VIII maintained, in the most express and impudent terms, that the universal church was under the dominion of the pontiffs, and that princes and lay-patrons, councils and chapters had no more power in spiritual things, than what they derived from CHRIST's vicar upon earth.

CENT.
XIII.

IV. The legates, whom the pontiffs sent into the provinces to represent their persons, and execute their orders, imitated perfectly the avarice and insolence of their masters. They violated the privileges of the chapters; disposed of the smaller, and sometimes of the more important ecclesiastical benefices, in favour of such as had gained them by bribes, or such like considerations [r]; extorted money from the people by the vilest and most iniquitous means; seduced the unwary by forged letters and other stratagems of that nature; excited tumults among the multitude, and were, themselves, the ring-leaders of the most furious and rebellious factions; carried on, in the most scandalous manner, the impious traffic of *relics* and *indulgences*, and distinguished themselves by several acts of profligacy still more heinous

The authority of the pope's legates.

[p] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 659. and principally tom. iv. p. 911.

[q] Idem, ib. p. 389.

[r] See BALUZI *Miscellanea*, tom. vii. p. 437. 475. 480, &c.

CENT.
XIII.The wealth
and revenues
of the pon-
tiffs aug-
mented.

than the practices now mentioned. Hence we find the writers of this age complaining unanimously of the flagitious conduct and the enormous crimes of the pope's legates [s]. Nay, we see the Roman pontiff ALEXANDER IV, enacting, in the year 1256, a severe law against the avarice and frauds of these corrupt ministers [t], which, however, they easily evaded by their friends and their credit at the court of *Rome*.

V. From the 11th century to this period the wealth and revenues of the pontiffs had not received any considerable augmentation; but at this time they were vastly increased under INNOCENT III and NICOLAS III, partly by the events of war, and partly by the munificence of kings and emperors. INNOCENT was no sooner seated in the papal chair, than he reduced under his jurisdiction the prefect of *Rome*, who had hitherto been considered as subject to the emperor, to whom he was bound by the oath of allegiance, he took to that prince in entering upon his office. He also seized upon *Ancona*, *Spoletto*, *Assisi*, and several cities and fortresses which had, according to him, been unjustly alienated from the patrimony of St. PETER [u]. On the other hand, FREDERIC II, who was extremely desirous that the pope should espouse his quarrel with OTHO IV, loaded the Roman see with the richest marks of his munificence and liberality, and not only made a noble present in valuable lands to the pope's brother [w], but also permitted RICHARD count of *Fundi* to leave, by will, all his pos-

[s] See that judicious and excellent writer MATTH. PARIS, in his *Historia Major*, p. 313. 316. 549. and particularly p. 637, where we find the following remarkable words: *Semper solent legati quales quales, et omnes nuncii papales regna quæ ingrediuntur depauperare, vel aliquo modo perturbare.* See also BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 659.

[t] This edict is published by LAMI, in his *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, tom. ii. p. 300.

[u] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Romanor. Pontif.* tom. iii. p. 161. — MURATORI *Antiq. Italicæ*, tom. i. p. 328.

[w] This brother of the pontiff was called RICHARD. See for an account of this transaction MURATORI's *Antiquitat. Italicæ*, tom. v. p. 652.

weeks, was succeeded by PETER JULIAN, bishop of *Tusculum*, who enjoyed that high dignity about eight months, and is distinguished in the papal list by the name of JOHN XXI [u]. The see of *Rome* continued vacant for above six months after the death of the last mentioned pontiff, but was, at length, filled in the month of November, 1277, by JOHN CAJETAN, of the family of *Ursins*, cardinal of *St. Nicolas*, whose name he adopted for his papal title. This famous pontiff, as has been already observed, augmented greatly both the opulence and authority of the bishops of *Rome*, and had formed vast projects, which his undaunted courage and his remarkable activity would have enabled him, without doubt, to execute with success, had not death blasted his hopes, and disconcerted his ambitious schemes.

XV. He was succeeded in the year 1281, about six months after his departure from this life, by SIMON DE BRIE, who adopted the name of MARTIN IV, and was not inferior to NICOLAS III, in ambition, arrogance, and constancy of mind, of which he gave several proofs during his pontificate. MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, the Grecian emperor, was one of the first princes, who was solemnly excommunicated by this audacious priest, and that, under the pretext of his having broken the peace that had been concluded between the Greek and Latin churches, at the council of *Lyons* [w]. The same insult was committed against PETER, king of *Arragon*, whom MARTIN not only excluded from the bosom of the church, but also deposed from his throne, on account of his attempt upon *Sicily*, and made a grant of his kingdom, fiefs, and possessions to CHARLES son of PHILIP the Bold [x], king of *France*. It was during the

Martin IV.
Nicolas IV.

[(u) In the original Dr. MOSHEIM observes, that these three successors of GREGORY were elected and carried off by death in the year 1276; but here he has fallen into a slight mistake; for JOHN XXI died the 16th of May, 1277.]

[w] This council had been held under the pontificate of GREGORY X.

[x] PHILIPPE LE HARDI, as he is called by the French.

execution

CENT.
XIII.

execution of such daring enterprizes as these, and while he was meditating still greater things for the glory of the Roman hierarchy, that a sudden death, in the year 1285, obliged him to leave his schemes unfinished. They were, however, prosecuted with great spirit by his successor JAMES SAVELLI, who chose the denomination of HONORIUS IV, but was also stopped short, in the midst of his career, in the year 1287, having ruled the church only two years. JEROME D'ASCOLI, bishop of *Præneste* [y], who was raised to the pontificate in the year 1288, and is known by the name of NICOLAS IV. distinguished himself, during the four years that he remained at the head of the church, by his assiduous application both to ecclesiastical and political affairs. Sometimes we see the disputes of sovereign powers left to his arbitration, and terminated by his decision; at other times, we find him maintaining the pretensions and privileges of the church with the most resolute zeal, and the most obstinate perseverance; at other times, again, we see him employing, with the utmost assiduity, every probable method of propagating the gospel among the Tartars and other eastern nations. But the object which, of all others, occupied most the thoughts of this vigilant and zealous pontiff, was the desperate state of the Christians in *Palestine*, who were now reduced to the greatest extremities of misery and weakness. His laborious efforts were, therefore, employed for the restoration of their former grandeur; they were, however, employed in vain, and his death, which happened in the year 1292, disconcerted all the projects he had formed for that purpose.

Celestine V.

XVI. The death of this pontiff was followed by a vacancy of three years in the see of *Rome*, which was owing to the disputes that arose among the cardinals about the election of a new pope. These disputes were, at length, terminated, and the contending parties united their suffrages in favour of PETER, surnamed DI MUR-

[(y) JEROM was bishop of *Palæstrina*, and not of *Præneste*. See FLEURY and the greatest part of the ecclesiastical historians.]

reign. He had, indeed, formed several important projects, but their execution was prevented by his death which happened, in the year 1264, after a short reign of three years. His successor GUI FULCIDI, or CLEMENT IV, a native of *France*, and bishop of *Sabino*, who was raised to the see of *Rome* in the year 1265, did not enjoy much longer that high dignity. His name, however, makes a greater figure in history, and was rendered famous in many respects, and more especially by his conferring the kingdom of *Naples* upon CHARLES of *Anjou*, brother to LEWIS IX. king of *France*. The consequences of this donation are well known, and the fate of CONRADIN, the last descendant of FREDERIC II, who after an unfortunate battle fought against CHARLES, was publicly beheaded by the barbarous victor, if not by the counsel, yet certainly with the consent, of the Roman pontiff, are well known to such as have the smallest acquaintance with the history of these unhappy times.

XIII. Upon the death of CLEMENT IV [q], there arose warm and vehement contests among the cardinals concerning the election of a new pontiff. These debates, which kept the Roman see vacant during the space of three years, were, at length, terminated in favour of THEALD, or THIBALD, a native of *Placentia*, and archbishop of *Liege*, who was raised to the pontificate in the year 1271, and assumed the title of GREGORY X [r]. This devout ecclesiastic was in the Holy Land when he received the news of his election; and, as he had been an eye-witness of the miserable condition of the Christians in that country, he had nothing so much at heart, as the desire of contributing to their relief. Hence it was, that, immediately after his consecration, he summoned a council to meet at *Lyons*, in the year 1274, in which the relief and maintenance of the Christians in *Palestine*, and the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches were the two great points, that were to

Gregory X.

[q] Which happened in the year 1268.

[r] The records of this election are published by LUC. WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 330.

CENT.
XIII.

come principally under deliberation. This assembly is acknowledged as the fourteenth general council, and is rendered particularly remarkable by the new regulations that were introduced into the manner of electing the Roman pontiff, and more especially, by the famous law, which is still in force, and by which it was enacted, that the cardinal electors should be shut up in the conclave during the vacancy of the pontificate. With respect to the character and sentiments of the new pope we shall only observe, that, though he seemed to be actuated by a milder spirit than many of his predecessors, yet he inculcated, without the least hesitation, that odious maxim of GREGORY VII, that declared the bishop of *Rome*, the lord of the world, and, in a more especial manner, of the Roman empire. It was in consequence of this presumptuous system, that, in the year 1271, he wrote an imperious and threatening letter to the German princes, in which, deaf to the pretensions and remonstrances of ALPHONSUS, king of *Castile* [s], he orders them to elect an emperor without delay, assuring them, that, if they did not do it immediately, he would do it for them. This letter produced the designed effect; an electoral diet was assembled at *Frankfort*, and RODOLPHUS, count of *Hapsbourg*, was raised to the imperial throne.

Innocent V.
Adrian V.
John XXI.
Nicolas III.

XIV. GREGORY X was succeeded, in the year 1276, by PETER of *Tarantaise*, of the dominican order, and bishop of *Ostia*, who assumed the name of INNOCENT V. and died about five months after his election. OTTOBONI, a native of *Genoa*, and cardinal of *St. Adrian*, was chosen in his place, took the title of ADRIAN V [t], and, after having ruled the church during five

[(s) ALPHONSUS, king of *Castile*, had been elected emperor in the year 1256, by the archbishop of *Triers*, the duke of *Saxony*, the margrave of *Brandenburg*, and the king of *Bohemia*, in opposition to RICHARD, duke of *Cornwall*, brother of HENRY III king of *England*, who was at the same time raised to the same dignity by the archbishops of *Mentz* and *Cologne*, the count *Palatine* of the *Rhine*, and the duke of *Bavaria*.]

[(t) We read in the Latin, ADRIAN VI, which is more probably an error of the press, than a fault of the author]

weeks,

tributed probably to the conclusion of his days, which happened soon after this remarkable event [k].

CENT.
XIII.

XI. GEOFFRY, bishop of *Milan*, who succeeded GREGORY IX, under the title of CELESTINE IV, died before his consecration, and, after a vacancy of twenty months, the apostolic stool was filled by SINIBALD, one of the counts of *Fiesque*, who was raised to the pontificate in the year 1243, assumed the denomination of INNOCENT IV, and yielded to none of his predecessors in arrogance and fury [l]. His elevation, however, offered at first a prospect of peace, as he had formerly been attached to the interests of the emperor, and accordingly the conferences were opened, and a reconciliation was proposed; but the terms offered by the new pope were too imperious and extravagant, not to be rejected with indignation by the emperor [m]. Hence it was that INNOCENT, not thinking himself safe in any part of *Italy*, set out from *Genoa*, the place of his birth, for *Lyons* in the year 1244, and assembling there a council the following year, deposed, in their presence, though not with their approbation, the emperor FREDERIC, and declared the imperial throne vacant [n]. This unjust and insolent measure was regarded with such veneration, and looked upon as so weighty by the German princes, seduced and blinded by the superstition of the times,

[k] Besides the original and authentic authors collected by MURATORI, in his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, and the German and Italian historians, few or none of whom are absolutely void of partiality in their accounts of these unhappy contests between the empire and the papacy, see PETRUS DE VINEIS, *Epistol. Lib. i.* and MATTH. PARIS, *Historia Major*. Add to these RAYNALDI *Annal.* — MURATORI *Annal. Italiæ*, tom. vii. & *Antiquit. Italic.* tom. iv. p. 325. 517. It must, however, be observed, that this branch of history stands yet in need of farther illustrations.

[l] See MATTHEW PARIS, *Historia Major*, ad A. 1254. p. 771.

[m] These preliminary conditions were: 1st, That the emperor should give up entirely to the church the inheritance which was left to it by MATILDA; and 2^{dy}, That he would oblige himself to submit to whatever terms the pope should think fit to propose, as conditions of peace.]

[n] This assembly is placed in the list of *æcumenical*, or general councils; but is not acknowledged as such by the Gallican church.

that

C. E. N. T.
XIII.

that they proceeded instantly to a new election, and raised first, HENRY, landgrave of *Thuringia*, and after his death, WILLIAM count of *Holland* to the head of the empire. FREDERIC, whose firm and heroic spirit supported without dejection these cruel vicissitudes, continued to carry on the war in *Italy*, until a violent dysentery ended his days in *Apulia*, the 13th of December, 1250. Upon the death of his formidable and magnanimous adversary, INNOCENT returned into *Italy* [o], hoping now to enjoy with security the fruits of his ambition. It was principally from this period, that the two famous factions, called *Guelphs* and *Ghibelines*, of which the latter espoused the cause of the emperors, and the former that of the pontiffs, involved all the Italian states in the most fatal dissensions, though their origin is much earlier than this century [p].

Alexander
IV. Urban
IV.

XII. RAYNALD, count of *Segni*, and bishop of *Ostia*, was raised to the pontificate after the death of INNOCENT, in the year 1254, and is distinguished in the list of the popes by the name of ALEXANDER IV. During the six years and six months that he governed the see of *Rome*, his time was less employed in civil affairs, than in regulating the internal state of the church, if we except the measures he took for the destruction of CONRADIN, grandson of FREDERIC II, and for composing the tumults that had so long reigned without interruption in *Italy*. The mendicant friars, in particular, and among them the Dominicans and Franciscans, were much favoured by this pontiff, and received several marks of his peculiar bounty.

He was succeeded in the Roman see A. D. 1261, by URBAN IV, a native of *Troyes*, of obscure birth, who, before his elevation to the pontificate, was patriarch of *Jerusalem*, and after that period was more distinguished by his instituting the *Festival of the body of Christ*, than by any other circumstance in the course of his

[o] Besides the writers already mentioned, see NICOL. DE CURBIO, *Vita Innocentii IV*, in BALUZII *Miscellan.* tom. vii. p. 353.

[p] See MURATORII *Dissertat. de Guelphis et Ghibellinis*, in his *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iv. p. 606.

reign.

menſe credit and opulence of the pontiffs and biſhops; and it was with a view to the execution of theſe grand projects, that he deferred the fulfilling of the ſolemn vow, by which he had engaged himſelf to march a formidable army againſt the infidels in *Paleſtine*. The pontiff, on the other hand, urged, with importunity, the emperor's departure, encouraged, animated, and ſtrengthened, by ſecret ſuccours, the Italian ſtates that oppoſed his pretenſions, and reſiſted the progreſs of his power by all the obſtacles which the moſt fertile invention could ſuggeſt. Theſe conteſts, however, had not, as yet, brought on an open rupture.

X. In the year 1227, HUGOLINUS, biſhop of *Oſtia*, whose advanced age had not extinguished the fire of his ambition, nor diminished the firmneſs and obſtinacy of his ſpirit, was raiſed to the pontificate, aſſumed the title of GREGORY IX, and kindled the feuds and diſſenſions, that had already ſecretly ſubſiſted between the church and the empire, into an open and violent flame. No ſooner was he placed in the papal chair, than, contrary to all juſtice and order, he excommunicated the emperor for putting off his expedition againſt the Saracens another year, though that delay was manifeſtly owing to a fit of ſickneſs, which ſeized that prince when he was ready to embark for *Paleſtine*. In the year 1228, FREDERIC, at laſt ſet out, arrived in the Holy Land; but, inſtead of carrying on the war with vigour, as we have had already occaſion to obſerve, he entered into a truce with SALADIN, and contented himſelf with the recovery of *Jeruſalem*. The pretended vicar of CHRIST, forgetting (or rather unwilling to perſuade himſelf) that his maſter's kingdom was not of this world, made war upon the emperor in *Apuglia* during his abſence [i], and uſed his utmoſt efforts to arm againſt him all the European powers. FREDERIC, having received informa-

The calamities that aroſe from the ambition of Gregory IX.

[[i] Under the feeble reign of HENRY III. the pope drew immenſe ſums out of *England* for the ſupport of this impious war, and carried his audacious avarice ſo far, as to demand the fifth part of the eccleſiaſtical revenues of the whole kingdom.]

CENT.
XIII.

tion of these perfidious and violent proceedings, returned into *Europe* in the year 1229, defeated the papal army, retook the places he had lost in *Sicily* and in *Italy*, and the year following made his peace with the pontiff from whom he received a public and solemn absolution. This peace, however, was but of a short duration; nor was it possible for the emperor to bear the insolent proceedings, and the imperious temper of GREGORY. He therefore broke all measures with that head-strong pontiff, distressed the states of *Lombardy* that were in alliance with the see of *Rome*, seized upon the island of *Sardinia*, which GREGORY looked upon as a part of his spiritual patrimony, and erected it into a kingdom for his son ENTIVS. These, with other steps that were equally provoking to the avarice and ambition of GREGORY, drew the thunder of the vatican anew upon the emperor's head in the year 1239. FREDERIC was excommunicated publicly with all the circumstances of severity that vindictive rage could invent, and was charged with the most flagitious crimes, and the most impious blasphemies by the exasperated pontiff, who sent a copy of this terrible accusation to all the courts of *Europe*. The emperor, on the other hand, defended his injured reputation by solemn declarations in writing, while, by his victorious arms, he avenged himself of his adversaries, maintained his ground, and reduced the pontiff to the greatest straits. To get rid of these difficulties, the latter convened, in the year 1240, a general council at *Rome*, with a view to depose FREDERIC by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals and prelates, that were to compose that assembly. But the emperor disconcerted that audacious project by defeating, in the year 1241, a Genoese fleet, on board of which the greatest part of these prelates were embarked, and by seizing, with all their treasures, these reverend fathers, who were all committed to close confinement. This disappointment, attended with others which gave an unhappy turn to his affairs, and blasted his most promising expectations, dejected and consumed the despairing pontiff, and contributed

ROME, from a mountain where he had hitherto lived in the deepest solitude and with the utmost austerity. This venerable old man, who was in high renown on account of the remarkable sanctity of his life and conversation, was raised to the pontificate in the year 1294, and assumed the name of CELESTINE V. But the austerity of his manners, which was a tacit reproach upon the corruption of the Roman court, and more especially upon the luxury of the cardinals, rendered him extremely disagreeable to a degenerated and licentious clergy; and this dislike was so heightened by the whole course of his administration, which shewed that he had more at heart the reformation and purity of the church, than the increase of its opulence and the propagation of its authority, that he was almost universally considered as unworthy of the pontificate. Hence it was, that several of the cardinals, and particularly BENEDICT CAJETAN, advised him to abdicate the papacy which he had accepted with such reluctance, and they had the pleasure of finding their advice received with the utmost docility. The good man resigned his dignity the fourth month after his election, and died in the year 1296, in the castle of *Fumone*, where his tyrannic and suspicious successor kept him in captivity, that he might not be engaged, by the solicitations of his friends, to attempt the recovery of his abdicated honours. His memory was precious to the virtuous part of the church, and he was elevated to the rank of a saint by CLEMENT V. It was from him that the branch of the benedictine order, called *Celestins*, and which yet subsists in *France* and in *Italy*, derived its origin [z].

XVII. BENEDICT CAJETAN, who had persuaded the good pontiff now mentioned to resign his place, succeeded him in it in the year 1294, and took the name of BONIFACE VIII. We may say, with truth, of this unworthy prelate, that he was born to be a plague both to church and state, a disturber of the repose of nations,

Boniface
VIII.

[z] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. vi. p. 180.

CENT.
XIII.

and that his attempts to extend and confirm the despotism of the Roman pontiffs, were carried to a length that approached to frenzy. From the moment that he entered upon his new dignity, he laid claim to a supreme and irresistible dominion over all the powers of the earth, both spiritual and temporal, terrified kingdoms and empires with the thunder of his bulls, called princes and sovereign states before his tribunal to decide their quarrels, augmented the papal jurisprudence with a new body of laws, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of Decretals*, declared war against the illustrious family of *Colonna*, who disputed his title to the pontificate [a]; in a word, exhibited to the church and to *Europe*, a lively image of the tyrannical administration of GREGORY VII, whom he perhaps surpassed in arrogance [b]. It was this pontiff that, in the year 1300, instituted the famous jubilee, which, since that time, has been regularly celebrated in the Roman church at certain fixed periods. But the consideration of this institution, which was so favourable to the progress of licentiousness and corruption, as also the other exploits of BONIFACE, and his deplorable end, belong to the history of the following century [c].

New monastic orders.

XVIII. In the council of Lateran that was held in the year 1215, a decree was passed, by the advice of INNOCENT III, to prevent the introduction of *new religions*, by which was meant, new monastic institutions. This decree, however, seemed to be very little respected, either by that pontiff, or his successors, since several reli-

[(a) The reasons they alledged for disputing the title of BONIFACE to the pontificate were, that the resignation of CELESTINE was not *canonical*, and, moreover, that it was brought about by fraudulent means.]

[b] There is a history of this pontiff written by Jo. RUBEUS, a Benedictin monk, whose work, which is entitled *BONIFACIUS VIII, e familia Cajetanorum principum Romanus pontifex*, was published at Rome in the year 1651, in 4to.

[c] In this account of the popes I have chiefly followed DANIEL PAPEBROCH, FRANCIS PAGI, and MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiae*, consulting, at the same time, the original sources collected by the last mentioned author, in his *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*.

giours

gious orders, hitherto unknown in the Christian world, CENT. XIII. were not only tolerated, but were, moreover, distinguished by peculiar marks of approbation and favor, and enriched with various privileges and prerogatives. Nor will this tacit abrogation of the decree of INNOCENT appear at all surprizing to such as consider the state of the church in this century. For not to mention many enormities that contributed to the suspension of this decree, we shall only observe, that the enemies of Christianity, and the *heretical* sects, increased daily every where; and, on the other hand, the *secular* clergy were more attentive to their worldly advantages than to the interests of the church, and spent in mirth and jollity the opulence with which the piety of their ancestors had enriched that sacred body. The monastic orders also had almost all degenerated from their primitive sanctity, and, exhibiting the most offensive and shocking examples of licentiousness and vice to public view, rendered by their flagitious lives the cause of heresy triumphant, instead of retarding its progress. All these things being considered, it was thought necessary to encourage the establishment of new monastic societies, who, by the sanctity of their manners, might attract the esteem and veneration of the people, and diminish the indignation which the tyranny and ambition of the pontiffs had so universally excited; and who, by their diligence and address, their discourses and their arguments, their power and arms, when these violent means were required, might discover, persecute, convert, and vanquish the growing tribe of heretics.

XIX. Of the religious societies that arose in this century some are now entirely suppressed, while others continue to flourish, and are in high repute at this present time. Among the former we may reckon the *Humiliati* (a title expressive of great humility and self-abasement) whose origin may be traced to a much earlier period than the present century, though their order was confirmed and modelled by INNOCENT III, who subjected it to the rule of St. BENEDICT. These *bumble* monks became so shockingly licentious in process of time, that,

Several of
the monastic
institutions
suppressed.

CENT.
XIII.

in the year 1571, Pope Pius V was obliged to dissolve their society [d]. We may also place in the list of the suppressed monasteries the *Jacobins*, who were erected into a religious order by INNOCENT III [e], and who, in this very century, not long after the council of *Lyons*, were deprived of their charter; the *Vallischolares*, or *scholars of the valley*, called from their being instituted by the *scholares*, i. e. the four professors of divinity in the university of *Paris*, and from a deep vale in the province of *Champagne* in which they assembled and fixed their residence in the year 1234 [f]. This society, whose foundation was laid about the commencement of this century, was formerly governed by the rule of St. AUGUSTIN, but is now incorporated into the order of the *Regular canons of Genievieve*. To the same class belong the order of the blessed *Virgin Mary the mother of Christ*, which had its commencement in the year 1266, and was suppressed in 1274 [g]; the *Knights of faith and charity*, who undertook to disperse the bands of robbers that infested the public roads in *France*, and who were favoured with the peculiar protection and approbation of GREGORY IX [h]; the *Hermits of St. William duke of Aquitaine* [i]; not to mention the *Brethren of the sack*, the *Bethlehemites*, and other orders of inferior note, that started up in this century, which, of all others, was the most remarkable for the number and variety of monastic establishments, that date their origin from it [k].

[d] HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vi. p. 152.[e] MATTH. PARIS, *Hist. Major*, p. 161.[f] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. iii. p. 15.—*Acta Sanct. Mens. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 482.[g] DION. SAMMARTHANI *Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 653.[h] *Gallia Christ.* tom. i. *Append.* p. 165.—MARTENE, *Voyage Litter. de deux Bénédictins*, tom. ii. p. 23.[i] JO. BOLLANDI *De ordine Eremitar. S. Guilielmi Comm. in actis SS. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 472.[k] MATTH. PARIS, *Hist. Major*, p. 815. edit. *Watts*. Where, speaking of the prodigious number of convents that were founded in *England* during this century, he expresseth himself thus: *Tot jam apparuerunt ordines in Anglia, ut ordinum confusio videretur inordinata.*

XX. Among the convents that were founded in this C E N T. XIII.

century, and still subsist, the principal place is due to that of the *servites*, i. e. *the servants of the blessed Virgin*, whose order was first instituted, A. D. 1233, in *Tuscany*, by seven Florentine merchants, and afterwards made a great progress under the government of PHILIP BENIZI as chief. This order, though subjected to the rule of St. AUGUSTIN, was, nevertheless, erected in commemoration of the most holy widowhood of the blessed Virgin; for which reason its monks wear a black habit [1], and observe several rules unknown to other monasteries. The prodigious numbers of Christians, that were made prisoners by the Mahometans in *Palestine*, gave rise, towards the conclusion of the XIIIth century, to the institution of the order, entitled, *The Fraternity of the Trinity*, which, in the following age, received a still greater degree of stability under the pontificate of HONORIUS III, and also of his successor CLEMENT IV. The first founders of this institution were JOHN DE MATHA and FELIX DE VALOIS, two pious men, who led an austere and solitary life at *Cerfroy*, in the diocese of *Meaux*, which is still the seat of the principal convent of the order. The monks of this society are called the *Brethren of the Holy Trinity*, because all their churches are solemnly dedicated to that profound mystery; they are also styled MATHURINS, from their having a monastery at *Paris* erected in a place where there is a chapel consecrated to St. MATHURIN, and *Brethren of the redemption of captives* [m], because the grand design of their institution was to find out means for restoring li-

The convents that still subsist.

[1] Besides the ordinary writers of the Monastic History, see PAULI FLORENTINI *Dialog. de origine Ordinis Servorum*, in LAMII *Deliciis Eruditorum*, tom. i. p. 1.—48.

[(m) BROUGHTON and some other writers make a distinction between the Order of the redemption of captives, and the Fraternity, or Brethren of the Holy Trinity. They alledge, that the latter order was instituted at Rome by St. PHILIP NERI in the year 1548, about 350 years after the first establishment of the former, and that the monks, who composed it, were obliged, by their vow, to take care of the pilgrims who resorted from all parts of the world to Rome, to visit the tombs of St. PETER and St. PAUL.]

CENT.
XIII.

The mendicant order.

berty to the Christian captives in the Holy Land, in which charitable work they are obliged to employ the third part of their revenue. Their manner of life was, at first, extremely abstemious and austere; but its austerity has been from time to time considerably mitigated by the indulgences and lenity of the pontiffs [n].

XXI The religious society that surpassed all the rest in the purity of its manners, the extent of its fame, the number of its privileges, and the multitude of its members, was that of the *Mendicant*, or begging friars, whose order was established in this century, and who, by the tenor of their institution, were to remain entirely destitute of all fixed revenues and possessions. The present state and circumstances of the church rendered the establishment of such an order absolutely necessary. The monastic orders, who wallowed in opulence, were, by the corrupting influence of their ample possessions, lulled in a luxurious indolence. They lost sight of all their religious obligations, trampled upon the authority of their superiors, suffered heresy to triumph unrestrained, and the sectaries to form assemblies in several places; in short, they were incapable of contributing in any respect to promote the true interests of the church, and abandoned themselves, without either shame or remorse, to all manner of crimes. On the other hand, the enemies of the church, the various sects which had left its communion, followed certain austere rules of life and conduct, which formed a strong contrast between them

[n] Beside HELYOT and the other writers of the Monastic History, see TOUSSAINT DE PLESSIS, *Hist. de l'Eglise de Meaux*, tom. i. p. 172 & 566.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. ii. p. 523.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 133.—In the ancient records this society is frequently styled the *Order of Asses*, on account of the prohibition of the use of horses, which made a part of their rule, and which obliged the mendicant monks to ride upon asses. See CAR. DU FRESNE'S *Notes upon Joinville's Life of St. Lewis*, p. 81. But at present, through the indulgence of the Roman pontiffs, they are permitted to make use of horses when they find them necessary. An order of the same kind was instituted in Spain, in the year 1228, by PAUL NOLASCO, under the title of the *Order of St. Mary for the redemption of captives*. See the *Acta Sanctorum Januar.* tom. ii. p. 980.

and the religious orders, and contributed to render the licentiousness of the latter still more offensive and shocking to the people. These sects maintained, that voluntary poverty was the leading and essential quality in a servant of CHRIST, obliged their doctors to imitate the simplicity of the apostles, reproached the church with its overgrown opulence, and the vice, and corruption of the clergy, that flowed from thence as from their natural source, and by this commendation of poverty and contempt of riches, acquired a high degree of respect, and gained a prodigious ascendant over the minds of the multitude. All this rendered it absolutely necessary to introduce into the church a set of men, who, by the austerity of their manners, their contempt of riches, and the external gravity and sanctity of their conduct and maxims, might resemble the doctors, who had gained so much reputation to the heretical sects, and who might be so far above the allurements of worldly profit and pleasure, as not to be seduced by the promises or threats of kings and princes, from the performance of the duties they owed to the church, or from persevering in their subordination to the Roman pontiffs. INNOCENT III was the first of the popes who perceived the necessity of instituting such an order; and accordingly, he gave such monastic societies as made a profession of poverty the most distinguishing marks of his protection and favour. They were also encouraged and patronized by the succeeding pontiffs, when experience had demonstrated their public and extensive usefulness. But when it became generally known, that they had such a peculiar place in the esteem and protection of the rulers of the church, their number grew to such an enormous and unwieldy multitude, and swarmed so prodigiously in all the European provinces, that they became a burthen, not only to the people, but to the church itself.

XXII. The great inconveniency that arose from the excessive multiplication of the mendicant orders was remedied by GREGORY X, in a general council which he assembled at *Lyons* in the year 1272. For here all the

CENT.
XIII.

Its history.

CENT.
XIII.

religious orders, that had sprung up after the council held, at *Rome*, in the year 1215, under the pontificate of INNOCENT III, were suppressed, and the *extravagant multitude of mendicants*, as GREGORY called them, were reduced to a smaller number, and confined to the four following societies, or denominations, viz. the *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans*, the *Carmelites*, and the *Hermits of St. Augustin* [o]. The *Carmelite* order which had been instituted in *Palestine*, during the preceding century, was, in this transplanted into *Europe*, and, in the year 1226, was favoured by pope HONORIUS III, *with a place among the monastic societies, which enjoyed the protection and approbation of the church. The *Hermits of St. Augustin* had for their founder ALEXANDER IV, who, observing that the *Hermits* were divided into several societies, some of which followed the maxims of the famous WILLIAM, others the rule of St. AUGUSTIN, while others again were distinguished by different denominations, formed the wise project of uniting them all into one religious order, and subjecting them to the same rule of discipline, even that which bears the name of St. AUGUSTIN. This project was put in execution in the year 1256.

Attracts the
veneration
and esteem
of the public.

XXIII. As the pontiffs allowed these four Mendicant orders the liberty of travelling wherever they thought proper, of conversing with persons of all ranks, of instructing the youth, and the multitude wherever they went; and, as their monks exhibited in their outward appearance and manner of life, more striking marks of gravity and holiness, than were observable in the other monastic societies, they arose all at once to the very summit of fame, and were regarded with the utmost esteem and veneration throughout all the countries of *Eu-*

[o] *Concil. Lugd. II. A. 1274, Can. xxiii. in Jo. HARDUINI Conciliis, tom. vii. p. 715. Importuna potentium inbiatio Religionum (so were the religious orders entitled) multiplicationem extorsit, verum etiam aliquorum præsumptuosa temeritas diversorum ordinum, præcipue Mendicantium . . . effrænatam multitudinem adinvenit . . . Hinc ordines Mendicantes post dictum concilium (i. e. the council of Lateran held in 1215) adiuvantos . . . perpetuæ prohibitioni subijcimus.*

[p] This edict of pope ALEXANDER IV is to be found in the new edition of the *Bullarium Romanum*, tom. i. p. 110.—See also *Acta Sanctor. Mens. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 472.

Europe. The enthusiastic attachment to these sanctimoni- C E N T.
ous beggars went so far, that, as we learn from the most XIII.
authentic records, several cities were divided, or can-
toned out, into four parts, with a view to these four or-
ders; the first part was assigned to the Dominicans; the
second, to the Franciscans; the third, to the Carmelites;
and the fourth, to the Augustinians. The people were
unwilling to receive the sacraments from any other hands
than those of the Mendicants, to whose churches they
crowded to perform their devotions, while living, and
were extremely desirous to deposite also their remains,
after death; all which occasioned grievous complaints a-
mong the ordinary priests, to whom the cure of souls
was committed, and who considered themselves as the
spiritual guides of the multitude. Nor did the influence
and credit of the Mendicants end here; for we find in
the history of this and of the succeeding ages, that they
were employed not only in spiritual matters, but also in
temporal and political affairs of the greatest consequence,
in composing the differences of princes, concluding trea-
ties of peace, concerting alliances, presiding in cabinet-
councils, governing courts, levying taxes, and other
occupations, not only remote from, but absolutely in-
consistent with, the monastic character and professi-
on.

XXIV. We must not however imagine, that all the The Domi-
Mendicant friars attained to the same degree of reputa- nicans.
tion and authority; for the power of the Dominicans
and Franciscans surpassed vastly that of the other two
orders, and rendered them singularly conspicuous in
the eyes of the world. During three centuries these
two fraternities governed, with an almost universal
and absolute sway, both state and church, filled the
most eminent posts ecclesiastical and civil, taught in the
universities and churches with an authority, before
which all opposition was silent, and maintained the pre-
tended majesty and prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs
against kings, princes, bishops, and heretics with incre-
dible ardour and equal success. The Dominicans and
Franciscans were, before the reformation, what the Je-
suits

CENT.
XIII.

suits have been since that happy and glorious period, the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, the secret springs of all the motions of the one and the other, and the authors or directors of every great and important event both in the religious and political world, DOMINIC, a Spaniard by birth, a native of the village of *Calaroga*, descendant of the illustrious house of *Guzman*, and regular canon of *Osma*, a man of a fiery and impetuous temper, and vehemently exasperated by the commotions and contests which the heretics of different denominations had excited in the church, set out for *France* with a few companions in order to combat the sectaries, that were multiplied in that kingdom. This enterprize he executed with the greatest vigour, and, we may add, fury, attacking the Albigenes and the other enemies of the church with the power of eloquence, the force of arms, the subtilty of controversial writings, and the terrors of the *inquisition*, which owed its form to this violent and sanguine priest. Passing from thence into *Italy*, he was honoured by the Roman pontiffs INNOCENT III and HONORIUS III with the most distinguished marks of their protection and favour; and, after many labours in the cause of the church, obtained from them the privilege of erecting this new fraternity, whose principal design was the extirpation of error, and the destruction of heretics. The first rule which he adopted for the new society was that of the *Canons of St. Augustin*, to which he added several austere precepts and observances. But he afterwards changed the discipline of the canons for that of the monks; and, holding a chapter of the order at *Bologna* in the year 1220, he obliged the brethren to take a vow of absolute poverty, and to abandon entirely all their revenues and all their possessions. He did not live long enough to see the consequences of this reformation, for he died the year following at *Bologna* [q]. His monks were, at first distinguished

[q] See JAC. ECHARD. and QUETIF in *Scriptoribus Ord. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 84.—*Acta Sancter. April.* tom. iii. p. 872.—NICOL. JANSENII *Vita*

tinguished by the denomination of *preaching friars*, because public instruction was the main end of their institution; but were afterwards called Dominicans after their founder [r]. [Just before his death DOMINIC sent GILBERT DE FRESNEY with twelve of the brethren into *England*, where they founded their first monastery at *Oxford* in the year 1221, and soon after, another at *London*. In the year 1276, the mayor and aldermen of the city of *London* gave them two whole streets by the river *Thames*, where they erected a very commodious convent, whence that place is still called *Black-Fryars*, for so the Dominicans were called in *England*.]

C B N T.
XIII.

XXV. FRANCIS, the founder of the famous order that bears his name, was the son of a merchant of *Affisi*, in the province of *Umbria*, and a young man who led, for some time, a most debauched and dissolute life. Upon his recovery from a severe fit of sickness, which was the consequence and punishment of his licentious conduct, he changed his method of living, and, as extremes are natural to men of warm imaginations, fell into an extravagant kind of devotion that looked less like religion, than alienation of mind. Sometime after this [s], he happened to be in a church, where he heard that passage of the scriptures repeated, in which CHRIST addresses his apostles in the following manner: *Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves, for the workman is worthy of his meat* [t]. This

The Fran-
ciscans.

Vita S. Dominici, *Antwerp* 1622, in 8vo. Add to these the long list of writers mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. med. ævi*, tom. ii. p. 137. and also ANTONII BREMONDI *Bullarium Ordinis Dominicani*, published some years ago at *Rome*.

[r] The Dominicans are called *Fratres Majores* in several of the ancient records, see ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecæ vet. ævi*, tom. ii. p. 172. This appellation, however, by which the Dominicans were set in opposition to the Franciscans, who call themselves *Fratres Minores*, is rather a term of derision, than a real name. In *France* the Dominicans are called *Jacobins*, from the street where their first convent was erected at *Paris* in the year 1218, which street was dedicated to *St. James*, and is still known by the name of *Rue de St. Jaques*.

[s] In the year 1208.

[t] *Matthew* x. 9, 10.

produced

CENT. produced a powerful effect upon his mind, made him
XIII. consider a voluntary and absolute poverty as the essence
of the gospel, and the soul of religion, and prescribe
this poverty as a sacred rule, both to himself, and to the
few that followed him. Such was the commencement
of the famous Franciscan order, whose founder and
chief was, undoubtedly a pious and well-meaning man,
though grossly ignorant, and manifestly weakened in his
intellect by the disorder from which he had but lately
recovered. Be that as it may, the new society, which
appeared to INNOCENT III extremely adapted to the
present state of the church, and proper to restore its de-
clining credit, was solemnly approved and confirmed by
HONORIUS III in the year 1223, and had already made
a considerable progress when its devout founder was cal-
led from this life in the year 1226. FRANCIS, through
an excessive humility, would not suffer the monks of
his order to be called *Fratres*, i. e. *brethren*, or *friars*,
but *Fraterculi*, i. e. *little brethren*, or *friars-minors* [u],
by which denomination they still continue to be distin-
guished [w]. The Franciscans came into *England* in
the reign of HENRY III, and their first establishment
was at *Canterbury*.

The emi-
nent ser-
vices ren-
dered to the
Roman pon-
tiffs by the
Dominicans
and Francis-
cans.

XXVI. These two celebrated orders restored the
church from that declining condition in which it had
been languishing for many years, by the zeal and acti-

[u] They were called *Fratricelli* by the Italians. *Freres Mineurs* by
the French, and *Fratres Minores* by the Latin writers.

[w] BONAVENTURE wrote a life of St. FRANCIS, which has passed
through several editions. But the most ample and circumstantial ac-
counts of this extraordinary man are given by LUKE WADDING, in the
first volume of his *Annal. Minorum*, which contains a complete history of
the Franciscan order, confirmed by a great number of authentic records,
and the best edition of which is that published at *Rome* in 1731 and the
following years, in eighteen volumes in folio, by JOSEPH MARIA
FONSECA ab EBORA. It is to the same WADDING that we are obliged
for the *Opuscula Sti. Francisci*, and the *Bibliotheca Ordinis Minorum*, the
former of which was published in 4to. at *Antwerp* in the year 1623,
and the latter at *Rome*, in 4to. likewise, in 1650. The other writers,
who have given accounts of the Franciscan order, are mentioned by
JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. mediæ ævi*, tom. ii. p.
573.

vity

vity with which they set themselves to discover and extirpate heretics, to undertake various negotiations and embassies for the interests of the hierarchy, and to confirm the wavering multitude in their implicit obedience to the Roman pontiffs. These ghostly rulers, on the other hand, sensible of their obligations to the new monks, which, no doubt, were very great, not only employed them in every affair they looked upon as of high importance, and raised them to the most eminent stations in the church, but also accumulated upon them employments and privileges, which, if they enriched them on the one hand, could not fail to render them odious on the other [x], and to excite the envy and complaints of other ecclesiastics. Such, among many other extraordinary prerogatives, was the permission they received from the pontiffs, of preaching to the multitude, hearing *confession*, and pronouncing *absolution*, without any licence from the bishops, and even without consulting them; to which we may add the heap of ample and extensive *indulgences*, whose distribution was committed by the popes to the Franciscans, as a mean of subsistence and a rich indemnification for their voluntary poverty [y]. These acts of liberality and marks

[x] The popes were so infatuated with the Franciscans, that those whom they could not employ more honourably in their civil negotiations or domestic affairs they made their publicans, beadles, &c. See for a confirmation of this the following passages in the *Histor. Major.* of MATTHEW PARIS: *Fratres minores et prædicatores* (says he) *invitos, ut credimus, jam suos fecit dominus papa, non sine ordinis eorum læsione et scandalo, telonarios et bedellos*, p. 634. — *Non cessavit papa pecuniam aggregare, faciens de Fratribus prædicatoribus et minoribus, etiam invitatis, non jam piscatoribus hominum, sed nummarum*, p. 639. Conf. p. 662. 664. — *Erant Minores et Prædicatores magnatum consiliatores et nuncii, etiam domini papæ secretarii: nimis in hoc gratiam sibi sæcularem comparantes*, ad An. 1236, p. 354. — *Facti sunt eo tempore Prædicatores et Minores regum consiliarii et nuntii speciales, ut sicut quondam mollibus induti in domibus regum erant, ita tunc qui vilibus vestiebantur, in domibus, cameris, et palatiis essent principum*. ad An. 1239, p. 465.

[y] See BALUZZI *Miscellan.* tom. iv. p. 490. tom. vii. p. 392. — It is well known that no religious order had the distribution of so many, and such ample *indulgences* as the Franciscans. Nor could these good friars

CENT.
XIII.

marks of protection, lavished upon the Dominican and Franciscan *friars* with such an ill-judged profusion, as they overturned the ancient discipline of the church, and were a manifest encroachment upon the rights of the first and second orders of the ecclesiastical rulers, produced the most unhappy and bitter dissensions between the Mendicant orders and the bishops. And these dissensions, extending their contagious influence beyond the limits of the church, excited throughout all the European provinces, and even the city of *Rome* [z], under the very eye of the pontiffs, the most dreadful disturbances and tumults. The measures taken by the popes to appease these tumults were various, but ineffectual; because their principal view was to support the cause of their faithful servants and creatures, the Mendicant friars, and to maintain them in the possession of their honours and advantages [a].

The dispute
between the
Dominicans
and the uni-
versity of
Paris.

XXVII. Among all the controversies which were maintained by the Mendicants, whether against the bishops, abbots, schools, or other religious orders, none was so famous, as that which arose, in the year 1228, between the Dominicans and the university of *Paris*, and which was prolonged, with various success, until the year 1259. The Dominicans claimed, as their unquestionable right, two theological classes in that celebrated university, one of which had been taken from them, and an academical law passed, that no religious order should have what the Dominicans demanded. These latter, however, persisted obstinately in reclaim-

friars live and multiply as they did, without some source or profit, since, by their institution, they were to be destitute of revenues and possessions of every kind. It was therefore in the place of fixed revenues, that such *fat indulgences* were put into their hands.

[z] BALUZZI *Miscellan.* tom. vii. p. 441.

[a] See JO. LAUNOII *Explicata Ecclesie Traditio circa Canonem: Omnis utriusque Sexus*, tom. i. part. I. Opp. p. 247.—RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, par M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 326.—LENFANT, *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, tom. i. p. 310.—tom. ii. p. 8.—ECHARDI *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 404. The circumstances of these flaming contests are mentioned by all the writers both of this and the following centuries.

ing

ing the professorship they had lost; while the doctors of the university perceiving the restless and contentious spirit that animated their efforts excluded them from their society, and formed themselves into a separate body. This measure was considered as a declaration of war; and, accordingly, the most vehement commotions arose between the contending parties. The debate was brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff in the year 1255; and the decision, as might well have been expected, was in favour of the monks. ALEXANDER IV ordered the university of *Paris*, not only to restore the Dominicans to their former place in that learned society, but moreover to make a grant to them of as many classes or professorships, as they should think proper to demand. This unjust and despotic sentence was opposed by the university with the utmost vigour, and thus the contest was renewed with double fury. But the magistrates of *Paris* were, at length, so terrified and overwhelmed with the thundering edicts, and formidable mandates of the exasperated pontiff, that, in the year 1259, they yielded to superior force, and satisfied the demands not only of the Dominican, but also of the Franciscan order in obedience to the pope, and to the extent of his commands [b]. Hence arose that secret enmity, that silent ill-will, which prevailed so long between the university of *Paris* and the Mendicant orders, especially the Dominicans, and which are not yet entirely extinguished.

XXVIII. In this famous debate none pleaded the cause of the university with greater spirit, and asserted its rights with greater zeal and activity than GUILLAUME DE ST. AMOUR, doctor of the Sorbonne, a man of true genius,

The Dominicans meet with a formidable adversary.

[b] See CÆS. EGASS. DU BOULAY, *Histor. Academ. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 138. 240. 244. 248. 266, &c.—JO. CORDESI, or (to mention him by the name he assumes) JO. ALITOPHILI *Præf. Histor. et Apologetica Opera Guilielmi de S. Amore.*—ANTOINE TOURON, *Vie de S. Thomas*, p. 134.—WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 247. 366. tom. iv. p. 4. 52. 106. 263.—MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major, ad An. 1228*, & NANGIS *Chronicon* apud DACHERIUM; *Spicilegii*, tom. iii. p. 8.

CENT.
XIII.

worthy to have lived in better times, and capable of adorning a more enlightened age. This vigorous and able champion attacked the whole Mendicant tribe in various treatises with the greatest vehemence, and more especially in a book *Concerning the perils of the latter times*. He maintained publicly, that their discipline was in direct opposition to the precepts of the gospel; and that, in confirming and approving it, the popes had been guilty of temerity, and the church was become chargeable with error [c]. What gave occasion to the remarkable title of this famous book was the author's being entirely persuaded that the prophecy of St. PAUL related to the *perilous times that were to come in the last days* [c], was fulfilled in the establishment of the Mendicant friars. This notion St. AMOUR maintained in the warmest manner, and proved it, principally, from the book called the *Everlasting Gospel*, which was explained publicly by the Dominicans and Franciscans, and of which we shall have occasion to speak more fully hereafter. The fury and resentment of the Mendicants were therefore kindled, in a peculiar manner, against this formidable adversary, whom they persecuted without interruption, until, in the year 1256, ALEXANDER VI ordered his book to be publicly burnt, and banished its author out of France, lest he should excite the Sorbonne to renew their opposition to these ghostly beggars. St. AMOUR submitted to the papal edict, and retired into the *Franche Comtè*, which was the place of his birth; but, under the pontificate of CLEMENT IV, he returned to Paris, where he illustrated the tenets of his famous book in a more extensive work, and died universally esteemed and regretted by all ranks and orders of men, except the Mendicants [d].

XXIX. While

[c] 2 Timothy iii. 1.

[d] The doctors of the university of Paris profess still a high respect for the memory of St. AMOUR, esteem his book, and deny obstinately that he was ever placed in the list of heretics. The Dominicans, on the contrary, consider him as a heretic of the first magnitude, if we may use that expression. Such of his works as could be found were published

XXIX. While the pontiffs accumulated upon the Mendicants the most honourable distinctions, and the most valuable privileges which they had to bestow, they exposed them still more and more to the envy and hatred of the rest of the clergy; and this hatred was considerably increased by the audacious arrogance that discovered itself every where in the conduct of these supercilious orders. They had the presumption to declare publicly, that they had a divine impulse and commission to illustrate and maintain the religion of JESUS; they treated with the utmost insolence and contempt all the different ranks and orders of the priesthood; they affirmed, without a blush, that the true method of obtaining salvation was revealed to them alone, proclaimed with ostentation the superior efficacy and virtue of their *indulgences*, and vaunted, beyond measure, their interests at the court of heaven, and their familiar connexions with the Supreme Being, the Virgin MARY, and the saints in glory. By these impious wiles they so deluded and captivated the miserable and blind multitude, that they would not entrust any others but the Mendicants with the care of their souls, their spiritual and eternal concerns [e]. We may give, as a specimen of these notorious frauds, the ridiculous fable which the Carmelites impose upon the credulous relating to SIMON STOCKIUS, the general of their order, who died about

CENT.
XIII.
The pride
and arro-
gance of the
Mendicants.

published in 4to. in the year 1632, at *Paris* (though the title bears *Constantiæ*) by CORDESIUS, who has prefixed to them a long and learned Preface, in which he defends the reputation and orthodoxy of St. AMOUR in a triumphant manner. This learned editor, to avoid the resentment and fury of the Mendicants, concealed his real name, and assumed that of JO. ALITOPHILUS. This did not, however, save his book from the vengeance of these friars, who obtained from LEWIS XIII, in the year 1633. an edict for its suppression, which TOURON, a Dominican friar, has published in his *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 164.—For a farther account of the life of this famous doctor, see WADDINGI. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 366.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 266.—NAT. ALEX. *Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xiii. cap. iii. Art. vii.* p. 95.—RICH. SIMON. *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 345.

[e] See MATTHEW PARIS, *ad A. 1246, Hist. Major.* p. 607. 630,

CENT
XIII.

the beginning of this century. To this ecclesiastic, they tell us that the Virgin MARY appeared, and gave him a solemn promise, that the souls of such, as left the world with the Carmelite cloak or *scapulary* upon their shoulders, should be infallibly preserved from eternal damnation [f]. And here let it be observed to the astonishment of all, in whom the power of superstition has not extinguished the plainest dictates of common sense, that this fiction, ridiculous, and impious as it was, found patrons and defenders even among the pontiffs [g].

Contests between the Dominicans and Franciscans.

XXX. It is, however, certain, that the Mendicant orders, though they were considered, as the main pillars of the hierarchy, and the principal supports of the papal authority, involved the pontiffs, after the death of DOMINIC and FRANCIS, in many perplexities and troubles, which were no sooner dispelled, than they were unhappily renewed; and thus the church was often reduced to a state of imminent danger. These tumults and perplexities began with the contests between the Dominicans and Franciscans about pre-eminence, in which these *bumble* monks loaded each other with the bitterest invectives, and the severest accusations both in their writings and their discourse, and opposed each other's interests with all the fury of disappointed ambition. Many schemes were formed, and various measures were employed for terminating these scandalous dissensions; but the root of the evil still remained, and the flame was rather covered than extinguished [h]. Besides this, the Franciscans were early divided among themselves, and split into several factions, which gather-

[f] See JO. LAUNOII *Lib. de Viso Stockii Oper.* tom. ii. part. II. p. 379.—*Actor. Sanctor.* tom. iii. *Mensis Maii ad diem xvi.*—THEOPH. RAYNAUDI *Scapulare Marianum*, tom. vii. Opp. p. 614.

[g] The late pope BENEDICT XIV, notwithstanding his pretended freedom from superstition and priestly fraud, has deigned to appear among the supporters of this gross fiction, though he defends it with his usual air of prudence and timidity, in his book *De Fests S. Mariæ Virg.* lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 472. tom. x. Opp. ed. Rom.

[h] See the *Alcoran des Cordeliers*, tom. i. p. 256. 266. 278, &c. LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iii. p. 380.

ed strength and consistence from day to day, and not only disturbed the tranquillity of the church, but struck at the supreme jurisdiction and prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs. And whoever considers with attention the series of events that happened in the Latin church from this remarkable period, will be fully convinced, that the Mendicant orders, whether through imprudence or design we shall not determine, gave several mortal blows to the authority of the church of *Rome*, and excited in the minds of the people those ardent desires of a reformation in the church, which produced in after times, such substantial and such glorious effects.

XXXI. The occasion of these intestine divisions among the Franciscans, was a dispute about the precise meaning of their rule. The founder and chief had made absolute poverty one of their indispensable obligations. The religious orders before his time were so constituted, that, though no single monk had any personal property, yet the whole community, considered as one collective body, had possessions and revenues, from whence each individual drew the means of his subsistence. But the austere chief of the Franciscans absolutely prohibited both separate and collective property to the monks of his order, and neither the individual nor the community were permitted to possess either fund, revenue, or any worldly goods [1]. This injunction appeared so severe to several of the Friars-minors, that they took the liberty to dispense with it as soon as their founder was dead; and in this they were seconded by the Roman pontiff, GREGORY IX, who, in the year 1231, published an interpretation of this rule, which

Intestine divisions among the Franciscans occasioned by different explanations of their rule.

[1] The words of the rule itself relating to this point are as follow.

C. vi. *Fratres sibi nihil approprient, nec domum, nec locum, nec aliquam rem: sed sicut peregrini et advenæ in hoc sæculo, in paupertate et humilitate famulantes Domino, vadant pro elemosynæ confidenter . . . (i. e. let them be sturdy beggars) . . . Hæc est illa celsitudo altissimæ paupertatis, quæ vos carissimos meos fratres hæredes et reges regni cælorum instituit.*

CENT.
XIII.

mitigated considerably its excessive rigor [k]. But this mitigation was far from being agreeable to all the Franciscans; it shocked the austere monks of that order, those, particularly, who were called the *Spiritual* [l], whose melancholy temper rendered them fond of every thing harsh and gloomy, and whose fanatical spirit hurried them always into extremes. Hence arose a warm debate, which INNOCENT IV decided, in the year 1245, in favour of those, who were for mitigating the severity of the rule in question. By this decree of the pontiff it was enacted, that the Franciscan friars should be permitted to possess certain places, habitations, goods and chattles, books, &c. and to make use of them, but that the *property* of all these things should reside in St. PETER, or the Roman church; so that without the consent of the Roman pontiff they might neither be sold, changed, nor transferred under any pretext whatsoever. This edict was considered by the gloomy part of the order as a most pernicious depravation of their holy rule, and was, consequently, opposed and rejected by them with indignation. Hence many of these *spiritual* mal-contents retired into the woods and desarts, while others were apprehended by CRESCENTIUS, the general of the society, and sent into exile [m].

XXXII. The face of affairs was, however, soon changed in their favour, when, in the year 1247, JOHN of *Parma*, was chosen general of the order. This famous ecclesiastic, who was zealously attached to the sentiments of the *spiritual*, recalled them from their exile, and inculcated upon all his monks a strict and unlimited obedience to the very letter of the rule that had been drawn up by St. FRANCIS [n]. By this reform he brought back the order to its primitive state, and the

[k] This bull was published by EMMANUEL RODERIC, in his *Collectio privilegiorum regularium Mendicantium et non Mendicantium*, tom. i. p. 8.

[l] LUC. WADDINGII *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 99. they were also called *Zelatores*, and *Cæsarians*, from their chief CÆSARIUS.

[m] Id. *ibid.* tom. iv. p. 128. & tom. iii. p. 171.

[n] Id. *ibid.* tom. iii. p. 171.

only reward he obtained for his zealous labours was to be accused as a rebellious heretic at the tribunal of the Roman pontiff ALEXANDER IV, in consequence of which he was obliged to resign his post. He had also the mortification to see the monks, who adhered to his sentiments, cast into prison, which unhappy lot he himself escaped with great difficulty [o]. His successor the famous BONAVENTURA, who was one of the most eminent scholastic divines of this century, proposed steering a middle course between the two contending factions, having nothing so much at heart as to prevent an open schism. Nevertheless, the measures he took to reconcile the jarring parties, and to maintain a spirit of union in the order, were not attended with that degree of success which he expected from them, nor were they sufficient to hinder the less austere part of the Franciscans from soliciting and obtaining, in the year 1247, from ALEXANDER IV, a solemn renewal of the mild interpretation which INNOCENT IV had given of the rule of their founder [p]. On the other hand, the faction that adhered to the sentiments of JOHN of *Parma*, maintained their cause with such success, that in an assembly of the order held in the year 1260, the explication of INNOCENT was abrogated and annulled, especially in those points, wherein it differed from that which had been formerly given by GREGORY IX [q].

XXXIII. This dispute concerning the true sense of the rule of St FRANCIS was followed by another of equal moment, which produced new and unhappy divisions among the monks of that order. About the commencement of this century, there were handed about in *Italy* several pretended prophecies of the famous JOACHIM, Another contest arises among the Franciscans concerning the Everlasting Gospel of the abbot Joachim.

[o] LUC. WADDINGII *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 4.

[p] This edict of ALEXANDER IV is published by WADDINGIUS, *Annal. Min.* tom. iv. p. 446. among the *Records*.

[q] The interpretation of GREGORY mitigated the rule of St. FRANCIS; but that of INNOCENT went much farther, and seemed to destroy its fundamental principles. See WADDINGII *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 128. The lamentable divisions, that reigned among the monks of this famous order, are described, in an accurate and lively manner, by BONAVENTURA himself, in a letter, which is extant in the *Annals* now cited, tom. iv. p. 58.

CENT.
XIII.

abbot of *Sora* in *Calabria* [r], whom the multitude revered as a person divinely inspired, and equal to the most illustrious prophets of ancient times. The greatest part of these predictions were contained in a certain book, entitled, *The Everlasting Gospel*, and which was also commonly called, *The Book of Joachim* [s]. This JOACHIM, whether a real or fictitious person we shall not pretend to determine, among many other future events foretold the destruction of the church of *Rome*, whose corruptions he censured with the greatest severity, and the promulgation of a new and *more perfect gospel* in the age of the *Holy Ghost*, by a set of poor and austere ministers, whom God was to raise up, and employ for that purpose. For he divided the world into *three ages*, relative to the three dispensations of religion that were to succeed each other in it. The two *imperfect ages*, to wit, the age of the Old Testament,

[(r) The resemblance that there is between the words *Sora* and *Flora*, has probably led Dr. MOSHEIM here into a slight mistake. *Sora* is not in *Calabria*, but in the province of *Capua*. It must therefore have been *Flora*, that our author intended to write, as SPANHEIM, FLEURY, and the other ecclesiastical historians have done.]

[s] The MERLIN of the English, the MALACHY of the Irish, and NOSTRADAMUS of the French, those pretended soothsayers, who, under the illusory, or feigned persuasion of a divine impulse, sung, in uncouth verse, the future revolutions of church and state, are just what we may suppose the JOACHIM of the Italians to have been. Many predictions of this latter were formerly handed about, and are still to be seen; nay, they have passed through various editions, and have been illustrated by the lucubrations of several commentators. It is not to be doubted, that JOACHIM was the author of various predictions, and that he, in a particular manner, foretold the reformation of the church, of which he might easily see the absolute necessity. It is, however, certain that the greatest part of the predictions and writings, which were formerly attributed to him, were composed by others; and this we may affirm even of the *Everlasting Gospel*, the work, undoubtedly, of some obscure, silly, and visionary author, who thought proper to adorn his reveries with the celebrated name of JOACHIM, in order to gain them credit, and to render them more agreeable to the multitude. The title of this senseless production is taken from *Revelations* xiv. 6. and it contained three books, the first was entitled, *Liber Concordiæ veritatis*, i. e. *The Book of the Harmony of Truth*. The second, *Apocalypsis Nova*, or *New Revelations*; and the third, *Psalterium decem Chordarum*, i. e. *The Ten-stringed Harp*. This account was taken from a manuscript of that work, in the library of the Sorbonne, by JAC. ECHARD, who has published it in his *Scriptores Dominic.* tom. i. p. 202.

which

which was that of the *Father*, and the age of the New, CENT.
XIII. which was under the administration of the Son, were, according to the predictions of this fanatic, now past, and the third age, even that of the *Holy Ghost*, was at hand. The *Spiritual*, i. e. the austere, Franciscans, who were, for the most part, well-meaning, but wrong-headed enthusiasts, not only swallowed down, with the most voracious and implicit credulity, the prophecies and doctrines that were attributed to JOACHIM, but applied these predictions to themselves, and to the rule of discipline established by their holy founder St. FRANCIS [1]; for they maintained that he delivered to mankind the *true gospel*, and that he was the angel whom St. JOHN saw flying in the midst of heaven [u].

XXXIV. At the very time that the intestine divisions among the Franciscans were at the greatest height, one of the *Spiritual* friars, whose name was GERHARD, undertook the explication of the *Everlasting Gospel* attributed to JOACHIM, in a book which appeared in the year 1250; under the title of *Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel* [w]. In this book the fanatical monk, among

Gerhard's
book con-
demned.

[1] This is acknowledged even by WADDING, notwithstanding his partiality in favour of the *spiritual* or austere Franciscans. See his *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 3—6.

[u] *Revel.* xiv. 6. *And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, &c.*—See on this subject BALUZZI *Miscellan.* tom. i. p. 221. 228. 235. 246.—ECHARDI *Scriptor. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 202.—*Codex Inquist. Tholosanæ* à LIMBORCHIA edit. p. 301, 302, 305, &c.

[w] As the accounts given of this book, by ancient and modern writers, are not sufficiently accurate, it may not be improper to offer here some observations that may correct their mistakes. 1. They almost all confound the *Everlasting Gospel*, or *The Gospel of the Holy Ghost*, (for so was it also called, as we are told by GUILL. DE ST. AMOUR, in his book *De Periculis noviss. Tempor.* p. 38.) with the *Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel*. But these two productions must be carefully distinguished from each other. The *Everlasting Gospel* was attributed to the abbot JOACHIM, and it consisted of three books, as has been already observed. But the *Introduction* to this Gospel was the work of a certain Franciscan monk, who explained the obscure predictions of the pretended Gospel, and applied them to his order. The *Everlasting Gospel* was neither complained of by the university of Paris, nor condemned by the Roman pontiff ALEXANDER IV; but the *Introduc-*

CENT. mong other enormities, as insipid as impious, inculcated
 XIII. the following detestable doctrine; " That St. FRANCIS,
 " who

tion was complained of, condemned and burnt, as appear, evidently from the letters of the above-mentioned pontiff, which are to be seen in BOULAY'S *Histor. Academ. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 292. The former consisted, as productions of that nature generally do, of ambiguous predictions, and intricate riddles, and was consequently despised, or neglected; but the latter was dangerous in many respects, 2. It is farther to be observed, that the ancient writers are not agreed concerning the author of this *Introduction*. They are unanimous in attributing it to one of the Mendicant friars; but the votaries of St. FRANCIS maintain, that the author was a Dominican; while the Dominican party affirm as obstinately, that he was a Franciscan. It is, however, certain, that the greatest part of the learned are of opinion, that the author of the infamous work in question was JOHN of Parma, general of the Franciscans, who is known to have been most warmly attached to the *spiritual* faction of that order, and to have maintained the sentiments of the abbot JOACHIM with an excessive zeal. See LUC. WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 9. who endeavours to defend him against this accusation, though without success. (See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iii. Martii, p. 157. for JOHN of Parma, though he preferred the Gospel of St. FRANCIS to that of CHRIST, has, nevertheless, obtained a place among the saints.) The learned ECHARD is of a different opinion, and has proved, in his *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i. p. 202, 203. from the curious manuscripts, yet preserved in the Sorbonne, relating to the *Everlasting Gospel*, that GERHARD, a Franciscan friar, was the author of the infamous *Introduction* to that book. This GERHARD, indeed, was the intimate friend and companion of JOHN of Parma, and not only maintained, with the greatest obstinacy, the cause of the *spiritual*, but also embraced all the sentiments, that were attributed to the abbot JOACHIM with such an ardent zeal, that he chose to remain eighteen years in prison, rather than to abandon them. See WADDINGII *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 4. 7. The Franciscans, who were called *observantes*, i. e. *vigilant*, from their professing a more rigid observance of the rule of their founder than was practised by the rest of their order, place GERHARD among the saints of the first rank, and impudently affirm, that he was not only endowed with the gift of prophecy, but also with and the power of working miracles. See WADDINGII *Annales Min.* tom. iii. p. 213, 214. It is to be observed 3dly, That whoever may have been the writer of this detestable book, the whole Mendicant order, in the judgment of the greatest part of the historians of this age, shared the guilt of its composition and publication, more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, who are supposed to have fallen upon this impious method of deluding the multitude into a high notion of their sanctity, in order thus to establish their dominions, and to extend their authority beyond all bounds. This opinion, however, is ill founded, notwithstanding the numbers by which it has been adopted. The Franciscans

" who was the angel mentioned in the *Revelations* XIV. CENT. XIII.

" 6. had promulgated to the world the true and everlasting gospel of God; that the gospel of CHRIST was to be abrogated in the year 1260, and to give place to this new and everlasting gospel which was to be substituted in its room; and that the minister of this great reformation were to be humble and bare-footed friars, destitute of all worldly emoluments [x]."

When this strange book was published at *Paris* in the year 1254, it excited in the doctors of the church, and, indeed, in all good men, the most lively feelings of horror and indignation against the Mendicant friars, who

Franciscans alone are chargeable with the guilt of this horrid production, as appear most evidently from the fragments of the book itself, which yet remain; but we are obliged in justice to observe farther, that this guilt does not even lie upon all the Franciscans, but only on that faction of the order, which is known under the title of the *Spiritual*. Perhaps we might go still farther and alledge, that the charge ought not to be extended even to all the members of this faction, but to such alone as placed an idle and enthusiastic confidence in the abbot JOACHIM, and gave credit to all his pretended prophecies. These observations are necessary to the true understanding of what has been said concerning the *Everlasting Gospel* by the following learned men; JO. ANDR. SCHMIDIUS, *Singular. Dissertat. Helmst.* 1700, in 4to.—USSERIUS, *De Successione Ecclesiar. Occident.* c. ix. § 20. p. 337.—BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 292.—NATAL. ALXANDER, *Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xiii.* Artic. iv. p. 78.—LUC. WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 9. Upon the whole it may be affirmed, that the book under consideration is not, as the greatest part of the learned have imagined, a monument of the arrogance of the Mendicant orders, but rather a proof of the impious fanaticism and extravagance of an handful of Franciscans.

[x] See GUIL. DE ST. AMOUR, *De Periculis noviss. Tempor.* p. 38, 39. who observes that the book, under consideration, was not indeed published before the year 1254, but that the opinions contained in it had an earlier origin, and were propagated even in the year 1200. Several of the ancient writers have given large extracts from this infamous book, see HERM. CORNERI *Chronicon*, in ECCARDI *Corpor. Histor. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 850.—*Chronicon Egmondanum*, in ANT. MATTHÆI *Annales veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 517.—RICOBALDUS apud ECCARDUM, *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 1215. But there is a great difference between these extracts, which seems to have arisen from this, that some drew their citations from the *Everlasting Gospel of Joachim*, while others drew theirs from the *Introduction of Gerbard*, not sufficiently distinguishing the one work from the other.

had

CENT.
XIII.

had already incurred the displeasure of the public on other accounts. This universal ferment engaged the Roman pontiff ALEXANDER IV, though much against his will, to order the suppression of this abominable book in the year 1255; he, however, took care to have this order executed with the greatest possible mildness, lest it should hurt the reputation of the Mendicants, and open the eyes of the superstitious multitude. But the university of *Paris* was not satisfied with these gentle and timorous proceedings; and consequently its doctors repeated without interruption their accusations and complaints, until the infamous production, that had given such just and general offence, was publicly committed to the flames [y].

The famous
constitution
of Nicolas
III, relating
to the rule of
St. Francis.

XXXV. The intestine flame of discord, that had raged among the Franciscans and was smothered, though not extinguished by the prudent management of BONAVENTURA, broke out anew with redoubled fury after the death of that pacific doctor. The Franciscan monks, who, were fond of opulence and ease, renewed their complaints against the rule of their founder as unreasonable and unjust, demanding what it was absolutely beyond the power of man to perform. Their complaints, however, were without effect, and their schemes were disconcerted by the Roman pontiff NICOLAS III, who leaned on the side of the austere Franciscans, and, in the year 1279, published that famous *constitution* which confirmed the rule of St. FRANCIS, and contained an accurate and elaborate explication of the maxims it recommended, and the duties it prescribed [z]. By this edict the pontiff renewed that part of the rule, that prohibited all kinds of property among the Franciscans, every thing that bore the least resemblance of a legal possession, or a fixed domain; but he granted to them, at the same time, the *use* of things necessary, such as

[y] See BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 299.—JORDANI *Chronicon*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 998.

[z] Some affirm, that this famous *Constitution* was issued out by NICOLAS IV; but their opinion is refuted by WADDING, in his *Annal. Min.* tom. v. p. 73.

houses,

houses, books, and other conveniencies of that nature, C E N T. XIII, the property of which, in conformity with the appointment of INNOCENT IV, was to reside in the church of *Rome*. Nor did the provident pontiff stop here, but prohibited, under the severest penalties, all private explications of this new law, lest they should excite disputes and furnish new matter of contention, and reserved the power of interpreting it to himself alone, and to his successors in the pontificate [a].

XXXVI. However disposed NICOLAS was to satisfy the *Spiritual*, and austere part of the Franciscan order, which was now become numerous both in *Italy* and *France*, and particularly in the province of *Narbonne*, the constitution above-mentioned was far from producing that effect. The monks of that gloomy faction that resided in *Italy*, received the papal edict with a sullen and discontented silence. Their brethren in *France*, and more especially in the southern parts of that kingdom, where the inhabitants are of a warm and sanguine complexion, testified, in an open and tumultuous manner, their disapprobation of this new constitution, and having at their head a famous Franciscan, whose name was JEAN PIERRE D'OLIVE, they excited new dissensions and troubles in the order [b]. This PIERRE D'OLIVE was a native of *Serignan* in *Languedoc*, who had acquired a shining reputation by his writings, and whose eminent sanctity and learning drew after him a great number of followers; nor is it to be denied, that there were many important truths and wise maxims in the instructions he delivered. One of the great objects, which he never lost sight of in his writings, was the corruption of the church of *Rome*, which he censured with a peculiar

Excites new troubles and exasperates the *Spiritual*.

[a] This constitution is yet extant in the *Jus Canon. Lib. vi. Decretal. Tit. xii. c. iii. p. 1028. ed. Bohmeriana*, and is vulgarly called the Constitution EXIIT, from its beginning thus: *Exiit, &c.*

[b] In some ancient records this ring-leader is called *Petrus Bitterrensis*, i. e. *Peter of Beziers*, because he resided for a long time in the convent of *Beziers*, where he performed the functions of a public teacher. By others, he is named *Petrus de Serignano*, from the place of his nativity. This remark is so much the more necessary, as certain authors have taken these three denominations for three distinct persons.

freedom

CENT.
XIII.

freedom and severity in a work entitled, *Postilla*, or *A Commentary on the Revelations*, affirming boldly, that that church was represented by the *whore of Babylon*, the *mother of harlots*, whom St. JOHN beheld *sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads, and ten horns* [c]. It is, however, to be observed, that this severe censor of a corrupt church was, himself, a most superstitious fanatic in several respects, having imbibed the greatest part of those monstrous opinions, which the *Spiritual* pretended to have received from the abbot JOACHIM; to which he added, an impious and extravagant veneration for St. FRANCIS, whom he considered as wholly and *entirely transformed into the person of Christ* [d]. In the debate, concerning the sense of the rule of this famous chief, he seemed to adhere to neither of the contending parties; for he allowed his followers the *bare use of the necessaries of life*, and being called upon, at different times, by the authority of his superiors to declare his sentiments upon this head, he professed his assent to the interpretation, that had been given of the rule, in question, by NICOLAS III. He leaned, nevertheless, to the side of those austere and *Spiritual* Franciscans, who not only opposed the introduction of property among the individuals of the order, but also maintained that the whole community, considered collectively, was likewise to be excluded from possessions of every kind. His zeal for these gloomy Franciscans was great, and he defended their cause with warmth [e]; hence he is looked upon as the chief of that faction, which disputed so often, and so vehemently, with the Roman pontiffs in favour of the *renuncia-*

[c] *Revelations* xvii. 3, 4, 5.

[d] *Totum CHRISTO configuratum*. See the *Littera Magistrorum de Postilla Fratris P. Job. Olivi*, in BALUZII *Miscellan.* tom. i. p. 213.—WADDINGII *Annales Minor.* tom. v. p. 51.

[e] The real sentiments of PIERRE D'OLIVE will be best discovered in the last discourse he pronounced, which is yet extant in BOULAY'S *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 535. and in WADDING'S *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 378.

tion of property, in consequence of the institution of St. CENT.
FRANCIS [f]. XIII.

XXXVII. The credit and authority of PIERRE D'OLIVE, whom the multitude considered not only as a man of unblemished sanctity, but also as a prophet sent from above, added new force and vigour to the *Spiritual*, and encouraged them to renew the combat with redoubled fury. But the prudence of the heads of the order prevented, for some time, the pernicious effects of these violent efforts, and so over-ruled the impetuous motions of this enthusiastic faction, that a sort of equality was preserved between the contending parties. But the promotion of MATTHEW of *Aqua Sparta*, who was elected general of the order in the year 1287, put an end to these prudential measures, and changed entirely the face of affairs. This new chief suffered the ancient discipline of the Franciscans to dwindle away to nothing, indulged his monks in abandoning even the very appearance of poverty, and thus drew upon him, not only the indignation and rage of the austere part of the *Spiritual* Franciscans, but also the disapprobation of the more moderate members of that party. Hence arose various tumults and seditions, first in the marquisate of *Ancona*, and afterwards in *France*, which the new general endeavoured to suppress by imprisonment, exile, and corporal punishments; but, finding all these means ineffectual, resigned his place in the year 1289 [g]. His successor RAYMOND GOFFREDI employed his utmost efforts to appease these

Continuation
of these de-
bates.

[f] For an account of this famous friar, see not only the common monastic historians, such as RAYNALDUS, ALEXANDER, and OUDIVUS, but also the following: BALUZII *Miscell.* tom. i. p. 213. and in *Vitis Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 752.—CAR. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis Ecclesiæ Erroribus*, tom. i. p. 226.—WARDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 52. 108. 121. 140. 236. and more specially p. 378, where he makes an unsuccessful attempt to justify his enthusiast.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 535.—SCHELNORNI *Amœnitates Litterariæ*, tom. ix. p. 678.—*Histoire Generale de Languedoc, par les Moines Benedictins*, tom. iv. p. 91. 179. 182. The bones of PIERRE D'OLIVE were raised by the order of the Roman pontiff JOHN XXII, and burnt publicly, with his writings, in the year 1325. See RAYNALD. *ad An.* 1325. § 20.

[g] WARDINGII *Annales Min.* tom. v. p. 210, 211. 235.

troubles.

CENT.
XIII.

troubles. For this purpose he recalled the banished friars, set at liberty those that had been cast into prison, and put out of the way several of the austerer Franciscans, who had been the principal fomenters of these unhappy divisions, by sending them into *Armenia* in the character of missionaries. But the disorder was too far gone to admit of a remedy. The more moderate Franciscans, who had a relish for the sweets of property and opulence, accused the new general of a partial attachment to the *Spiritual*, whom he treated with peculiar affection and respect, and therefore employed their whole credit to get him removed from his office, which, with much difficulty, they, at length, effected under the pontificate of BONIFACE VIII. On the other hand, the more rigid part of the *Spiritual* faction renounced all fellowship, even with such of their own party as discovered a pacific and reconciling spirit; and, forming themselves into a separate body, protested publicly against the interpretation which NICOLAS III had given of the rule of St. FRANCIS. Thus, from the year 1290, the affairs of the Franciscans carried a dismal aspect, and portended nothing else than seditions, and schisms in an order, that had been so famous for its pretended disinterestedness and humility [b].

XXXVIII. in the year 1294, a certain number of Italian Franciscans, of the *Spiritual* party, addressed themselves to CELESTIN V, for a permission to form a separate order, in which they might not only profess, but also observe, in the strictest manner, that austere rule of absolute poverty, which St. FRANCIS had prescribed to his followers. The good pontiff, who, before his elevation to the head of the church, had led a solitary and austere life [i], and was fond of every thing that looked like

[b] WADDINGII *Annal. Min.* tom. v. p. 108. 121. 140. and more especially p. 235 236.

[(i)] This pope, whose name was PETER MEURON, had retired very young to a solitary mountain, in order to devote himself entirely to prayer and mortification. The fame of his piety brought many to see him from a principle of curiosity, several of whom renounced the world, and became the companions of his solitude. With these he formed

like mortification and self-denial, granted, with the utmost facility, the request of these friars, and placed at the head of the new order a monk, whose name was LIBERATUS, and who was one of the greatest *self-tormentors* of all the monastic tribe [k]. Soon after this, CELESTIN, finding himself unfit for the duties of his high and important office, resigned the pontificate, in which he was succeeded by BONIFACE VIII, who annulled every act that had been passed during the short reign of his predecessor, and suppressed among other institutions, the new order, which had assumed the title of the *Celestin Hermits of St. Francis* [l]. This disgrace was, as it were, the signal, which drew upon them the most furious attacks of their enemies. The worldly-minded Franciscans persecuted them with the most unrelenting bitterness, accused them of various crimes, and even cast upon them the odious reproach of Manicheism. Hence many of these unhappy fanatics retired into *Achaia*, from whence they passed into a small island, where they imagined themselves secured from the rage of their adversaries, and at liberty to *indulge* themselves in all the austerities of that miserable life, which they looked upon as the perfection of holiness here below. But no retreat was sufficient to screen them from the vigilance and fury of their cruel persecutors, who left no means unemployed to perpetuate their miseries. In the mean time, that branch of the *Spiritual* Franciscans that remained in *Italy*, continued to observe the rigorous laws of their primitive institution in spite of BONIFACE VIII, who used his utmost efforts to conquer their obstinacy. They erected societies of their order first in the kingdom of *Naples*, afterwards in the *Milanese*, and in the marquisate of *Ancona*; and, at length, formed a kind of community, in the year 1254, which was approved by URBAN IV, in 1264, and erected into a distinct order, called *The Hermits of St. Damien*. Upon MEURON's elevation to the pontificate, and his assuming the name of CELESTIN V, his order, which must not be confounded with the new *Franciscan Celestin Hermits*, took the title of *Celestins*.]

[k] WADDINGII *Annales*, tom. v. p. 324. 338.

[l] Id. *ibid.* tom. vi. p. 1.—*Bullarium Magnum Contin.* III, IV. p. 108, 109.

CENT.
XIII.

length, spreading themselves through the greatest part of *Europe*, they continued in the most violent state of war with the church of *Rome*, until the face of things was changed by the reformation. In these conflicts they underwent trials and sufferings of every kind, and multitudes of them perished in the flames, as miserable victims to the infernal fury of the *Inquisition* [m].

XXXIX. To-

[m] The writers, that serve generally as guides in this part of the history of the church, and whom I have been obliged to consult upon the divisions of the Franciscans, whose history, as will soon appear, is peculiarly interesting and important, are far from meriting the encomiums that are due to perspicuity and exactness. This part of the Ecclesiastical History of, what is called, the *Middle Age*, has not hitherto been accurately illustrated by any writer, though it be, every way, worthy of the labours of the learned, and of the attention of Christians. Its principal merit consists herein, that it exhibits striking examples of piety and learning struggling against the power of superstition and ignorance, and against that spiritual tyranny of which they were the principal supports. Nay, these very rebellious Franciscans, though fanatical and superstitious in several respects, deserve, nevertheless, an eminent rank among those who prepared the way for the reformation in *Europe*, and who excited in the minds of the people a just aversion to the church of *Rome*. RAYNALDUS, BZOVIVS SPONDANUS, in their Annals, EYMERICUS, in his *Directorium Inquisitorum*, and NATALIS ALEXANDER, in his Ecclesiastical History, relate the Revolutions, that happened in the Franciscan order and in the church in general during this period; but their accounts are neither so accurate, nor so ample, as the importance of the events deserved. And as it is from these authors that the protestant historians have drawn their materials, we need not be surprized at the defects with which these latter abound. WADDING, who merits the highest encomiums as a laborious and learned writer, is yet an uncertain guide, when he treats of the matters now under consideration. His attachment to one party, and his fear of the others, lay him under restraints, that prevent his declaring the truth with a noble freedom. He shades his picture with dexterity. He conceals, dissembles, excuses, acknowledges, and denies, with such a timorous prudence and caution, that the truth could not but suffer considerably under his pen. He appears to have been attached to the rigid Franciscans, and yet had not the courage to declare openly that they had been injured by the pontiffs. He saw, on the other hand, the tumults and perplexities in which these rigid Franciscans had involved the church of *Rome*, and the strokes they had levelled, with no small success, at the majesty of the pontiffs; but he has taken all imaginable pains to throw such a shade upon this part of their conduct, as conceals its violence from the view of his readers. Such then being the characters of the writers, who have handed down to us the history of the church in this important period, I could fol-

low

XXXIX. Towards the conclusion of this century, arose in *Italy* the enthusiastic sect of the *Fratricelli* and *Bizochi*, which, in *Germany* and *France*, received the denomination of *Beguards*. They were condemned by BONIFACE VIII [n] and by several of his successors; and the *inquisitors* were charged by these despotic pontiffs to persecute them until they were entirely extirpated, which commission they executed with their usual barbarity. The *Fratricelli*, or *Little Brethren*, were Franciscan monks, who separated themselves from the grand community of St. FRANCIS, with a design to observe the laws of their parent and founder in a more strict and rigorous manner than they were observed by the other Franciscans; and who, accordingly, renounced every kind of possession and property both common and personal, and begged from door to door their daily subsistence [o]. They alledged that neither CHRIST nor his apostles

C. N. T.
XIII.
The Fratricelli and
Beguards.

low none of them as a sure or constant guide in all the events they relate, the judgments they form, or the characters they describe. I have not, however, been destitute of a clue to conduct me through the various windings of this intricate labyrinth. The testimonies of ancient authors, with several manuscripts that have never yet been published, such as the *Diploma's* of the Pontiffs and Emperors, the *Acts of the Inquisition*, and other Records of that kind, are the authentic sources from whence I have drawn my accounts of many things that have been very imperfectly represented by other historians.

[n] See TRITHEMIUS, *Annal. Hirsaug.* tom. ii. p. 74. though this author is defective in several respects, and more especially in his accounts of the origin and sentiments of the *Fratricelli*. It is also to be observed, that he confounds, through the whole of his history, the sects and orders of this century one with another in the most ignorant and unskilful manner. See rather DU BOULAY, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 541. where the edict, published in the year 1297, by BONIFACE VIII. against the *Bizochi*, or *Beguards*, is inserted; as also JORDANI *Chronicon*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Italiæ*, tom. iv. p. 1020.

[o] The *Fratricelli* resemble the *Spiritual* in many of their maxims and observances: they, however, are a distinct body, and differ from them in various respects. The *Spiritual*, for instance, continued to hold communion with the rest of the Franciscans, from whom they differed in points of considerable moment, nor did they ever pretend to erect themselves into a particular and distinct order; the *Fratricelli*, on the contrary, renounced all communion with the Franciscans, and, withdrawing their obedience from the superiors of that society, chose for themselves a new chief, under whom they formed a new and separate

CENT.
XIII.

apostles had any possessions either *personal*, or *in common*, and that *they* were the models, whom St. FRANCIS commanded his followers to imitate. After the example also of their austere founder they went about cloathed with sordid garments, or rather with loathsome rags, declaimed against the corruption of the church of Rome, and the vices of the pontiffs and bishops, foretold the reformation of the church, and the restoration of the true gospel of CHRIST by the *genuine* followers of St. FRANCIS, and declared their assent to, almost, all the doctrines, which were published under the name of the abbot JOACHIM. They esteemed and respected CELESTIN V, because, as has been already observed, he was, in some measure, the founder of their society, by permitting them to erect themselves into a separate order. But they refused to acknowledge, as true and lawful heads of the church, his successor BONIFACE, and the other pontiffs after him, who opposed the *Fratricelli*, and persecuted their order [p].

XL. As

order. The *Spiritual* did not absolutely oppose their orders possessing certain goods jointly, and in common, provided they renounced all property in these goods, and confined their pretensions to the mere *use* of them; whereas the *Fratricelli* rejected every kind of possession, whether personal or in common, and embraced that absolute poverty and want, which St. FRANCIS had prescribed in his *Rule*, and in his last *Testament*. We omit the mention of other less important differences that might be alledged here.

[p] The accounts of the *Fratricelli*, that are given by ancient and modern writers, even by those that pretend to the greatest exactness, are extremely confused and uncertain. TRITHEMIUS, in his *Annal. Hist. saug.* tom. ii. p. 74 affirms, that they derived their origin from TANCHELINUS, and thus ignorantly confounds them with the *Catharists* and other sects that arose in those times. The Franciscans leave no means unemployed to clear themselves from all relation to this society, and to demonstrate, that such a pestilential and impious sect, as that of the *Fratricelli*, did not derive their origin from the order of St. FRANCIS. In consequence of this, they deny that the *Fratricelli* professed the Franciscan rule; and maintain, on the contrary, that the society, which was distinguished by this title, was a heap of rabble, composed of persons of all kinds and all religions, whom HERMAN PONGILUP, towards the conclusion of this century, gathered together at Ferrara in Italy, and erected into a distinct order. See LUC. WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 279. This author employs all his eloquence

XL. As the Franciscan order acknowledged, as its com-
panions

CENT.
XIII.

to defend his order from the infamous reproach of having given rise to that of the *Fratricelli*: But his efforts are vain; for he acknowledges, nay, even proves by unquestionable authorities, that this hated sect professed and observed, in the most rigorous manner, the rule of St. FRANCIS, and, nevertheless, he denies that they were Franciscans; by which he means, and indeed can only mean, that they were not such Franciscans as those, who lived in subjection to the general of the order, and adopted the interpretation which the pontiffs had given of the rule of their founder. All WADDING's boasted demonstration, therefore, comes to no more than this, that the *Fratricelli* were Franciscans, who separated themselves from the grand order of St. FRANCIS, and rejected the authority of the general of that order, and the laws and interpretations, together with the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs; and this no mortal ever took it into his head to deny. HERMANUS, or, as he is called by many, ARMANNUS PONGILUP, whom WADDING and others consider as the parent of the *Fratricelli*, lived, in this century, at *Ferrara* in the highest reputation on account of his extraordinary piety; and when he died in the year 1269, was interred with the greatest magnificence and pomp in the principal church of that city. His memory was, for a long time, honoured with a degree of veneration equal to that which is paid to the most illustrious saints; and it was supposed that the supreme Being bore testimony to his eminent sanctity by various miracles. But as PONGILUP had been suspected of heresy by the *Inquisitors* *, on account of the peculiar austerity of his life, which resembled that of the *Catharists*, they made, even after his death, such an exact and scrupulous inquiry into his maxims and morals, that, many years after he was laid low in the grave, his impiety was detected and published to the world. Hence it was, that, in the year 1300, his tomb was destroyed, his bones dug up, and burned by the order of BONIFACE VIII, and the multitude effectually cured of the enthusiastic veneration they had for his memory. The judicial acts of this remarkable event are recorded by MURATORI, in his *Antiquit. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 93—147. and it appears evidently from them, that those learned men, who consider PONGILUP as the founder of the order of the *Fratricelli*, are entirely mistaken. So far was he from being the founder of this sect, that he was dead before it was in being. The truth of the matter is, that this famous enthusiast was a *Catharist*, infected with *Paulician* or *Manichean* principles, and that he was a member of the sect entitled *Bagnolists*, from a town of that name in *Provence*, where they resided. Some modern writers, indeed, have seen so far into the truth, as to perceive that the *Fratricelli* were a separate branch of the rigid and austere Franciscans; but they err in this, that they consider them as the same sect with the *Beguards* or *Beguins*, under a different denomination. Such is the opinion adopted by LIMBORCH, in his *Hist. Inquisit.* lib. i. cap. xix. p. 69. who appears to have been very little acquainted with the

Tertiaries,
Bocafoti, and
Beguins.

* These formidable censors were entitled, *Inquisitors of Heretical Pravity*.

panions and associates, a set of men who observed the *third rule* that was prescribed by St. FRANCIS, and were from

the matters now under consideration, by BALUZIUS, in his *Miscellan.* tom. i. p. 195. & *Vit. Pontif. Avenionens.* tom. i. p. 509. by BEAUSOBRE, in his *Dissertation concerning the Adamites*, subjoined to the *History of the Wars of the Hussites*, p. 380. and by WADDING, in his *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 376. But, notwithstanding the authorities of these learned men, it is certain, as we shall shew in its place, that there was a real difference between the *Fratricelli* and the *Beguards*, not indeed with respect to their opinions, but in their rule of discipline and their manner of life.

The principal cause of the errors, that have obscured the *History of the Fratricelli*, is the ambiguity that there is in the denomination of their order. *Fratricellus*, *Fruterculus*, or *Little Brother*, was an Italian nick-name, or term of derision, that was applied in this century to all those, who, without belonging to any of the religious orders, affected a monkish air in their cloathing, their carriage, and their manner of living, and assumed a sanctimonious aspect of piety and devotion. See VILLANI *Istorie Fiorentine*, lib. viii. c. 84. p. 423.—IMOLA in *Dante*, p. 1121. in MURATORI *Antiq. Ital.* tom. i. And as there were many vagabonds of this kind, that wandered about from place to place during this century, it happened, that this general term of *Fratricelli* was applied to them all, though they differed much from one another both in their opinions and in their methods of living. Thus the *Catharists*, the *Waldenses*, the *Apostles*, and many other sects, who had invented new opinions in religion, were marked with this denomination by the multitude; while the writers of foreign nations, unacquainted with this ludicrous application of the word, were puzzled in their inquiries after the sect of the *Fratricelli*, who had given so much trouble to the Roman pontiffs, nay, were led into the grossest mistakes, and imagined at one time, that this order was that of the *Catharists*, at another, that it was the sect of the *Waldenses*, &c. But, in order to have distinct ideas of this matter, it must be considered, that the word *Fruterculus*, or *Little Brother*, bore a quite different sense from the ludicrous one now mentioned, when it was applied to the austere part of the Franciscans, who maintained the necessity of observing, in the strictest manner, the rule of their founder. Instead of being a nick-name, or a term of derision when applied to them, it was an honourable denomination, in which they delighted, and which they preferred infinitely before all other titles. *Fratricelli*, or *Little Brothers*, is a word of the same signification with *Friars-minors*; and every one knows, that this latter appellation was adopted by the Franciscans, as an expression of their extraordinary humility and modesty. In assuming this title therefore, these monks did not, properly speaking, assume a new name, but only translated the ancient name of their order into the Italian language; for what the Latins called *Fratres Minores*, i. e. *Friars-minors*, that the Italians called *Fratricelli*. Of the many proofs we might draw from the

from thence commonly called *Tertiaries* [q]; so likewise the order of the *Fratricelli*, who were desirous of being considered

CENT.
XIII.

the best authors in favour of this account of the matter, we shall only alledge one, from the *Life of Thomas Aquinas*, by GUILIELMUS DE THOCO in *Actis Sanctior. Martii*, tom. i. cap. ii. § xxi. *Destruxit* (says that biographer) *et tertium pestiferum pravitatis errorem S. Thomas . . . cujus sectatores, simul et inventores SE NOMINANT FRATERCULOS DE VITA PAUPERE, ut etiam sub hoc humilitates sophistico nomine simplicium corda seducant Contra quem errorem pestiferum Johannes Papa XXII mirandam edidit Decretalem.*

Now this very Decretal of JOHN XXII against the *Fratricelli*, which THOCO calls *Admirable*, is, to mention no other testimonies, a sufficient and satisfactory proof for what I have affirmed in relation to that sect. In this Decretal, which is to be seen in the *Extravagantia Joh. XXII. Corporis Juris Canon.* tom. ii. p. 1112. ed. *Bobmerianæ*, the pontiff expresses himself thus: *Nonnulli profanæ multitudinis viri, qui vulgariter Fratricelli seu Fratres de paupere vita, Bizocchi sive Beguini nuncupantur in partibus Italiæ, in insula Siciliæ . . . publice mendicare solent.* The pontiff afterwards divides the *Fratricelli*, into *Monks* and *Tertiaries*, or (which amounts to the same thing as we shall shew in its place) into *Fratricelli* and *Beguins*. With respect to the *Fratricelli*, properly so called, he expresses himself thus: *Plurimi regulam seu ordinem Fratrum Minorum . . . Se profiteri ad litteram conservare confingunt, prætendentes se sanctæ memoriæ Cælestino Papa Quinto, prædecessore nostro, hujus status, seu vitæ privilegium habuisse. Quod tamen, etsi ostenderent, non valeret, cum Bonifacius Papa Octavus ex certis causis rationabilibus omnia ab ipso Cælestino concessa . . . viribus penitus evacuaverit.* Here the pontiff describes clearly those *Fratricelli*, who, separating themselves from the *Franciscans* with a view to observe more strictly the rule of St. FRANCIS, were erected into a distinct order by pope CELESTIN V. And in the following passage he characterises, with the same perspicuity, the *Bizocchi* or *Beguins*, who entitled themselves of *The third order of the penitents of St. Francis*: *Nonnulli ex ipsis asserentes se esse de tertio ordine beati Francisci pœnitentium vocato, prædictum statum et ritum eorum sub velamine talis nominis satagunt palliare.*

[q] Besides two very austere rules drawn up by St. FRANCIS, the one for the *Friars-minors*, and the other for the *Poor Sisters*, called *Clarisses*, from St. CLARA their founder, this famous chief drew up a third, whose demands were less rigorous, for such, as, without abandoning their worldly affairs, or resigning their possessions, were, nevertheless, disposed to enter, with certain restrictions, into the *Franciscan* order, and desirous of enjoying the privileges that were annexed to it. This rule prescribed fasting, continence, hours of devotion and prayer, mean and dirty apparel, gravity of manners, and things of that nature, but neither prohibited contracting marriage, accumulating wealth, filling civil employments, nor attending to worldly affairs. All the *Franciscan* historians have given accounts of this third rule, more especially WAD-

CENT.
XIII.

considered as the genuine followers of St. FRANCIS, had a great number of *Tertiaries* attached to their cause. These *Tertiaries*, or half-monks, were called, in *Italy*, *Bizochi* and *Bocasoti*; in *France*, *Beguins*, and in *Germany*, *Beguards*, or *Beghards*, which last was the denomination by which they were commonly known in almost all places [r]. They differed from the *Fratricelli*,

DING. *Annal. Min.* tom. ii. p. 7.—HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 214. They, that professed this third rule, were called *Friars of the penance of Christ*, and sometimes also, on account of the meanness of their garments, *Brethren of the sack*, but they were more generally known by the denomination of *Tertiaries*. The greatest part of the religious orders in the church of *Rome*, imitated this institution of St. FRANCIS, as soon as they perceived the various advantages that were deducible from it. And hence, at this day, these orders continue to have their *Tertiaries*.

[r] The *Tertiaries*, that were connected with the order of the *Fratricelli*, arose about the year 1296, in the marquisate of *Ancona* and the neighbouring countries, and were called *Bizochi*, as we learn from the edict issued out against them, in the year 1297, by BONIFACE VIII. and published by DU BOULAY, in his *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 541. They are mentioned under the same title by JOHN XXII, in the book already cited. Add to all these authorities, that of the learned DU FRESNE, who, in his *Glossar. Latinit. mediæ*, tom. i. p. 1188, observes, that this denomination is derived from *Bizochus*, which signifies in French *une Besace*, i. e. a sack, or wallet, such as beggars in general and these holy beggars in particular, were used to carry about with them. The term *Bocasotus*, or *Vocasotus*, as DU BOULAY writes it (in his *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 510.) has no doubt the same origin, and bears the same signification. It is used by JORDAN, in his *Chronicle*, from whence we shall cite a remarkable passage in the following note. The denominations of *Beghards* and *Beguins*, that were given to the *Tertiaries* in *France* and in *Italy*, are very frequently to be met with in the Ecclesiastical History of the Middle Age. The accounts, however, which both ancient and modern writers generally give of these famous names, are so uncertain, and so different from each other, that we need not be surprized to find the history of the *Beghards* and *Beguins* involved in greater perplexity and darkness, than any other part of the Ecclesiastical Annals of the age now mentionrd. It is therefore my present design to remove this perplexity, and to dispel this darkness, as far as that can be done in the short space to which I am confined, and to disclose the true origin of these famous denominations.

The words *Beghard*, or *Beggehard*, *Begutta*, *Beghinus*, and *Beghin*, which only differ in their termination, have all one and the same sense. The German and Belgic nations wrote *Beghard* and *Begutta*, which terminations are extremely common in the language of the ancients.

celli, not in their opinions and doctrine, but only in their manner of living. The *Fratricelli* were real monks,

CENT.
XIII.

subjected
cient Germans. But the French substituted the Latin termination in place of the German, and changed *Beghard* into *Beghinus* and *Beghina*; so that those, who in *Holland* and *Germany* were called *Beghard* and *Begutte*, were denominated in *France* *Beghini* and *Beghinæ*. Nay, even in *Germany* and *Holland*, the Latin termination was gradually introduced instead of the German, particularly in the feminine term *Begutta*, of which change we might alledge several probable reasons, were this the proper place for disquisitions of that nature. There are many different opinions concerning the origin and signification of these terms, which it would be too tedious to mention, and still more so to refute. Besides, I have done this in a large work, now almost finished, concerning the *Beghards* and *Beghines*, wherein I have traced out, with the utmost pains and labour, in Records, the greatest part of which have never seen the light, the history of all the different sects to whom these names have been given, and have, at the same time, detected the errors, into which many learned men have fallen in treating this part of the history of the church *. At present therefore, setting aside many opinions and conjectures, I shall confine myself to a brief inquiry into the true origin and signification of these words. They are, undoubtedly, derived from the old German word *beggen*, *beggeren*, which signifies to *seek any thing with importunity, zeal, and earnestness*. In joining to this word the syllable *hard*, which is the termination of many German words, we have the term *Beggehard*, which is applicable to a person who asks any thing with ardor and importunity. And as none are so remarkable for asking in this manner, as common beggars, who subsist upon the liberality of the public, therefore, in the ancient German language, they were called *Beghard*, from which the English word *beggar* is manifestly derived. *Begutta* signifies a female beggar.—When Christianity was introduced into *Germany*, the word *beggen*, or *beggeren*, was used in a religious sense, and expressed the act of devout and fervent prayer to the supreme Being. Accordingly we find, in the Gothic translation of the Four Gospels attributed to ULPILAS, the word *beggen* employed to express the duty of *earnest and fervent prayer*. Hence when any person distinguished himself from others by the frequency and fervor of his devotional services, he was called a *Beghard*, i. e. a *devout man*; and the denomination of *Begutta* was given, in the same sense, to women of uncommon piety. And as they, who distinguished themselves from others by the frequency of their prayers, assumed by that means a more striking air of external devotion than the rest of their fellow-christians; hence it came to pass, that all those who were ambitious of appearing more religious and devout than their neighbours, were called *Beghardi*, or *Begutta*.

The observations we have hitherto made with respect to the origin and signification of the words in question, will serve as a clue to de-

L 1 4

liver

* The work here hinted at has not yet appeared, though we hope that those who are entrusted with the papers of the learned author, will prevent such a valuable production being lost to the republic of letters.

subjected to the rule of St. FRANCIS: while the *Bizochi*, or *Beguins*, if we except their sordid habit, and certain obser-

liver the attentive reader from that labyrinth of difficulties in which the history of the *Beghards* and *Beghinæ* has been involved. They will also enable him to account for the prodigious multitudes of *Beghards* and *Beguines* that sprung up in *Europe* in the XIIIth century; and will shew him how it happened, that these denominations were given to above thirty sects or orders, which differed widely from each other in their opinions, their discipline, and manner of living. The first and original signification of the word *Beghard* (or *Beggert*, as it was pronounced by the common people) was *importunate beggar*. Therefore when the people saw certain persons, not only embracing with resignation, but also with the most voluntary choice, and under a pretext of devotion, the horrors of absolute poverty, begging their daily bread from door to door, and renouncing all their worldly possessions and occupations, they called all such persons *Beghards*, or, if they were women, *Begburts*, without ever once considering the variety of opinions and maxims by which they were distinguished. The sect called *Apostles*, the rigid Franciscans, the *Brethren of the free spirit*, (of whom hereafter) all embraced this sordid state of beggary; and though among these orders there was not only the widest difference, but even the greatest opposition, the Germans called themselves indiscriminately *Beghards*, from the miserable state which they had all embraced. Nor is this to be wondered at; the character, which they possessed in common, was striking; while the sentiments and maxims that divided them, escaped the observation of the multitude.

But the word *Beghard* acquired a second and a new signification in this century, being employed, as we have already observed, to signify a person who *prayed* with uncommon frequency, and who *distinguished himself from those about him by an extraordinary appearance of piety*. The force of this term, in its new signification, is the same with that of the word *Methodist*, which is at present the denomination of a certain set of fanatics in these kingdoms. Such therefore as departed from the manner of living that was usual among their fellow citizens, and distinguished themselves by the gravity of their aspect, and the austerity of their manners, were comprehended under the general denomination of *Beghards* and *Beguttes* in *Germany*, and of *Beguin* and *Beguines* in *France*. The use of these terms was, at first, so extensive, that, as we could shew by many examples, they were applied even to those who formed a sort of an intermediate order between the *monks* and *citizens*, and who resembled the former in their manner of living, without assuming their name, or contracting their obligations. The *Tertiaries* therefore, or half-monks of the Dominican, Franciscan, and, in general, of all the religious orders, were called *Beghards*; for though, as *lay-citizens*, they belonged to the body politic, yet they distinguished themselves by their monkish dispositions, and their profession of extraordinary piety and sanctity of manners. The *Fraternity of weavers*, the

observances and maxims, which they followed in consequence of the injunctions of the famous saint now mentioned, lived after the manner of other men, and were therefore considered in no other light, than as *seculars* and *laymen* [s]. It is, however, to be observed, that the

CENT.
XIII.

the *Brethren of St. ALEXIUS*, the *Followers of Gerbard the Great*, in a word, all who pretended to an uncommon degree of sanctity and devotion were called *Begbards*, although they procured themselves the necessaries of life by honest industry, without having recourse to the sordid trade of begging.

The denominations therefore of *Begbards*, *Beguttes*, *Beguins*, and *Beguines* are rather honourable than otherwise, when we consider their origin; and they are mentioned as such, in several records and deeds of this century, whose authority is most respectable, particularly in the Testament of St. LEWIS, king of France. But, in process of time, these terms lost gradually, as the case often happens, their primitive signification, and became marks of infamy and derision. For among these religious *beggars*, and these sanctimonious pretenders to extraordinary piety, there were many, whose piety was nothing more than the most senseless superstition, many also, whose austere devotion was accompanied with opinions of a corrupt nature, and entirely opposite to the doctrine of the church, and (what was still more horrible) many artful hypocrites, who, under the mask of religion, concealed the most abominable principles, and committed the most enormous crimes. These were the fools and knaves, who brought the denomination of *Begbards* into disrepute, and rendered it both ridiculous and infamous; so that it was only employed to signify idiots, heretics, or hypocrites. The denomination of *Lolbards*, of which we shall have occasion to speak more amply hereafter, met with the same fate, and was rendered contemptible by the persons who masked their iniquity under that specious title.

[s] See the *Acta Inquis. Tholos.* published by LIMBORCH, p. 298. 302. 310. 313. and particularly 307. 329. 382. 389, &c. Among the various passages of ancient writers, which tend to illustrate the history of the *Fratricelli* and *Beguins*, I shall quote only one, which is to be found in JORDAN'S *Chronicon*, published by MURATORI, in his *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iv. p. 1020. and confirms almost every thing we have said upon that head: *Anno 1294, Petrus de Macerata et Petrus de Forosemproneo Apostatæ fuerunt ordinis Minorum et hæretici. His petentibus eremitice vivere, ut Regulam B. Francisci ad litteram servare possent. Quibus plures Apostatæ adhæserunt, qui statum communitatis damnabant et declarationes Regulæ, et vocabant se Fratres S. Francisci* (he ought to have said *Fratricellos*) *Sæculares* (i. e. the *Tertiaries*, who were the friends and associates of the *Fratricelli*, without quitting, however, their secular state, or entering into the monastic order.) *Sæculares autem vocarunt Bizocios aut Fratricellos vel Bocafotos* (here JORDAN is mistaken,

CENT.
XIII.

the *Bizochi* were divided into two classes, which derived their different denominations of *perfect* and *imperfect*, from the different degrees of austerity that they discovered in their manner of living. The *perfect* lived upon alms, abstained from wedlock, and had no fixed habitations. The *imperfect*, on the contrary, had their houses, wives, and possessions, and were engaged, like the rest of their fellow-citizens, in the various affairs of life [t].

A great difference between the Franciscan Beguines and those of Germany and the Netherlands.

XLI. We must not confound these *Beguins* and *Beguines*, who derived their origin from an austere branch of the Franciscan order, with the German and Belgic *Beguines*, who crept out of their obscurity in this century, and multiplied prodigiously in a very short space of time [u]. Their origin was of an earlier date than this

taken, in affirming, that the *Sæculares* were called *Fratricelli*; for this latter name belonged only to the true monks of St. FRANCIS, and not to the *Tertiaries*. The other circumstances of this account are exact, and shew that the more austere professors of the Franciscan rule were divided into two classes, viz. into *friars* and *seculars*, and that the latter were called *Bizochi*) *li dogmatizabant, quod nullus summus Pontifex Regulam B. Francisci declarare potuit. Item, quod Angelus abstulit a Nicolao tertio Papatus auctoritatem. . . . Et quod ipsi soli sunt in via Dei et vera ecclesia, &c.*

[t] This division is mentioned, or supposed by several authors, and more especially in the *Acta Inquisit. Tholosanæ* p. 303. 310. 312. 313. 319, &c.

[u] In the last century there was a great debate carried on in the Netherlands concerning the origin of the *Beghards* and *Beguines*, of which I have given an ample account in a work not yet published. In the course of this controversy the *Beguines* produced the most authentic and unexceptionable records, and diplomas, from which it appeared, that so early as the XI and XIIth centuries, there had been several societies of *Beguines* established in *Holland* and *Flanders*. It is true, they had no more than three of these authentic acts to offer as a proof of their antiquity; the first was drawn up in the year 1065, the second in the year 1129, the third in 1151, and they were all three drawn up, at *Vilvorden*, by the *Beguines*, who, at that time were settled there. See AUB. MIRÆI *Opera Diplomatico-historica*, tom. ii. c. 26. p. 348. and tom. iii. p. 628. edit. Nov.—ERYCIUS PUTEANUS, *De Begbinarum apud Belgas instituto et nomine suffragio*. This treatise of PUTEANUS is to be found with another of the same author and upon the same subject, in a work entitled, JOSEPHI GELDOLPHI a RYCKEL *Vita S. Veggæ cum Adnotationibus*, p. 65—227. Duaci 1631, in 4to. Now, though we grant that

this century, but it was only now that they acquired a name, and made a noise in the world. Their primitive establishment was, undoubtedly, the effect of virtuous dispositions and upright intentions. A certain number of pious women, both virgins and widows, in order to maintain their integrity, and preserve their principles from the contagion of a vicious and corrupt age, formed themselves into societies, each of which had a fixed place of residence, and was under the inspection and government of a female head. Here they divided their time between exercises of devotion, and works of honest industry, reserving to themselves the liberty of entering into the state of matrimony, as also of quitting the convent, whenever they thought proper. And as all those among the female sex, who made extraordinary professions of piety and devotion, were distinguished by the title of *Beguines*, i. e. persons who were uncommonly *assiduous in prayer*, that title was given to the women of whom we are now speaking [w]. The first society of

CENT.
XIII.

that those writers are mistaken, who place the first rise of the *Beguines* in the XII or XIIIth century, yet the small number of authentic records, which they have to produce in favour of their antiquity, is an incontestable proof of the obscurity, in which they lay concealed, before the time in which these writers place their origin, and may render it almost probable, that the only *convent of Beguines*, that existed before the XIIIth century, was that of *Vilworden* in *Brabant*.

[w] All the *Beghards* and *Beguines* that yet remain in *Flanders* and *Holland*, where their convents have almost entirely changed their ancient and primitive form, affirm unanimously, that both their name and institution derive their origin from St. BEGGHE, dutchess of *Brabant*, and daughter of PEPIN, mayor of the palace to the king of *Austrasia*, who lived in the VIIth century. This lady, therefore, they consider as their patroness, and honour her as a kind of tutelary divinity with the deepest sentiments of veneration and respect. See Jos. GELD. a RYCKEL in *Vita S. Beggæ cum Adnotat. Duaci et Lovanii edita*, a work of great bulk and little merit, and full of the most silly and insipid fables. — Those, who are no well-wishers to the cause of the *Beguines*, adopt a quite different account of their origin, which they deduce from LAMBERT LE BEGUE, a priest and native of *Liege*, who lived in the XIth century, and was much esteemed on account of his eminent piety. The learned PETER COENS, canon of *Antwerp*, has defended this opinion with more erudition than any other writer, in his *Disquisitio Historica de Origine Beginarum et Beghinagiorum in Belgio*, Leod. 1672, in 12mo.

this

CENT.
XIII.

this kind, that we read of, was formed at *Nivelle* in *Brabant*, in the year 1226 [x]; and was followed by so many institutions of a like nature in *France*, *Germany*, *Holland*, and *Flanders*, that, towards the middle of the XIIIth century, there was scarcely a city of any note, that had not its *beguinage*, or *vineyard*, as it was sometimes called in conformity to the style of the *Song of Songs* [y]. All these female societies were governed by the same laws: but, in the greatest part of them, the hours, that were not devoted to prayer, meditation, or other religious exercises, were employed in weaving, and embroidering, and other manual labours of various kinds. The poor, sick, and disabled *Beguines* were supported by the pious liberality of such opulent persons as were friends to the order.

Beghards o
Lollards.

XLII. This female institution was soon imitated in *Flanders* by the other sex; and considerable numbers of unmarried men, both batchelors and widowers formed themselves into communities of the same kind with those of the *Beguines*, under the inspection and government of a certain chief, and with the same religious views and purposes; still, however, reserving to themselves the liberty of returning to their former method of life [z]. These pious persons were, in the style of this age, called *Beghards*, and, by a corruption of that term usual among the Flemish and Dutch, *Bogards*; from others they received the denomination of *Lollards*; in *France* they were distinguished at first by that of *Bons Valets*, or

[(x) Other historians say, in the year 1207.]

[y] See MATTH. PARIS, *Hist. Major*, ad An. 1243 & 1250, p. 540. 696.—THOMAS CANTIPRATENSIS in *Bono Universali de Apibus*, lib. ii. cap. li. p. 478. edit. *Colvenerii*.—PETRUS DE HERENTHAL, in his *Annals*, from which, though they are not yet published, we have a very remarkable passage cited by JOS. GELDOLPH. a RYCKEL, in his *Observationes ad Vitam S. Beggæ*, § cxcvi. p. 355. The origin and charters of the convents of *Beguines*, that were founded during this and the following century in *Holland* and *Flanders*, are treated in an ample manner by AUB. MIRÆUS, in his *Opera Historico-diplomatica*, JOHN BAPT. GRAMMAYE, in his *Antiquitates Belgicæ*, ANTON. SANDERS, in his *Brabantia et Flandria illustrata*, and by the other writers of *Belgic history*.

[z] MATTH. PARIS, *Hist. Major*, ad An. 1253, p. 539, 540.

Bons

Bons Garçons, and afterwards by that of *Beguins*; they were also called the *Fraternity of weavers*, from the trade, which the greatest part of them exercised. The first society of the *Beghards* seems to have been that which was established at *Antwerp* in the year 1228, and continues still in a flourishing state; though the *brethren*, of whom it is composed, have long since departed from their primitive rule of discipline and manners. This first establishment of the *Beghards* was followed by many more in *Germany*, *France*, *Holland*, and *Flanders*; though, after all their success, their congregations were less numerous than those of the *Beguines* [a]. It is worthy of observation, that the Roman pontiffs never honoured the societies of the *Beghards* and *Beguines* with their solemn or explicit approbation, nor confirmed their establishments by the seal of their authority. They, however, granted them a full toleration, and even defended them often against the stratagems and violence of their enemies, who were many in number. This appears by the edicts in favour of the *Beghards*, which the pontiffs granted in compliance with the earnest solicitations of many illustrious personages, who wished well to that society. It did not, however, continue always in a flourishing state. The greatest part of the convents, both of the *Beghards* and *Beguines*, are now either demolished, or converted to other uses. In *Flanders*, indeed, a considerable number of the latter still subsist, but few of the former are to be found any where.

XLIII. After the accounts hitherto given of the rulers of the church, and of the monastic and other religious orders that were instituted, or became famous du-
Greek writers.

[a] See RYCKELII *Vita S. Beggæ*, p. 635.—ANT. SANDERII *Flandria Illustrata*, lib. c. xvi. p. 136.—JO. BAPT. GRAMMAYEI *Antiquit. Fland. & in Gandavo*, p. 22.—AUB. MIRÆI *Opera Diplom. Hist.* tom. iii. c. 168. p. 145.—HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 248. who is, nevertheless, chargeable with many errors.—GERHARDUS ANTONINUS *Pater Minister* (so the head of the order is called in our times) *Beghardorum Antwerpiensium in Epistola ad Ryckium de Beghardorum origine et fatis*, in RYCKELII *Vita S. Beggæ*, p. 489. This author, indeed, from a spirit of partiality to his order, conceals the truth designedly in various places.

ring this century, it will not be improper to conclude this chapter by mentioning briefly the Greek and Latin writers, who, during the same period, acquired a name by their learned productions. The most eminent among the Greeks were

NICETAS ACOMINATUS, who composed a work entitled, *The History and Treasure of the Orthodox Faith*;

GERMANUS, the Grecian patriarch, of whom we have yet extant, among other productions of less note, *A Book against the Latins*, and *An Exposition of the Greek Liturgy*;

THEODORUS LASCARIS, who left behind him several treatises upon various subjects of a religious nature, and who also entered the lists against the Latins, which was the reigning passion among all the Greeks, who were endowed with any tolerable parts, and who were desirous of shewing their zeal for the honour of their nation;

NICEPHORUS BLEMMIDA, who employed his talents in the salutary work of healing the divisions between the Greeks and Latins;

ARSENIUS, whose *Synopsis of the Canon Law of the Greeks*, is far from being contemptible;

GEORGIUS ACROPOLITA, who acquired a high degree of renown, not only by his historical writings, but also by the transactions and negotiations in which he was employed by the emperor MICHAEL;

JOHANNES BECCUS, or VECCUS, who involved himself in much trouble, and made himself many enemies, by defending the cause of the Latins against his own nation with too much zeal;

GEORGE METOCHITA, and CONSTANTINE MELITENIOTA, who employed, without success, their most earnest efforts to bring about a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

GEORGE PACHYMERES, who acquired a name by his commentary upon DIONYSIUS, the pretended chief of the mystics, and by a history which he composed of his own time; and

GEORGE the Cyprian, whose hatred of the Latins, and warm opposition to VECCUS above-mentioned, rendered

dered him more famous than all his other productions CENT.
XIII.
[b].

XLIV. The prodigious number of Latin writers that appeared in this century renders it impossible for us to mention them all; we shall therefore confine our account to those among them, who were the most eminent, and whose theological writings demand most frequently our notice in the course of this history. Such are,

JOACHIM, abbot of *Flora* in *Calabria*, who, though esteemed on account of his piety and knowledge, was, nevertheless, a man of mean parts and of a weak judgment, full of enthusiastic and visionary notions, and therefore considered, during his life and after his death, by the miserable and blinded multitude, as a prophet sent from above. The pretended prophecies of this silly fanatic are abundantly known, and have been frequently published [c];

STEPHEN LANGTON, archbishop of *Canterbury*, who wrote commentaries upon the greatest part of the books of scripture [d];

FRANCIS, the founder of the famous society of *Friars-minors*, or *Franciscans*, whose writings were designed to touch the heart, and excite pious and devout sentiments, but discover little genius, and less judgment;

ALAN DE L'ISLE, a logician, who made no mean figure among that disputatious tribe, who applied himself also to the study of chemistry, and published several

[b] For a more ample account of all these writers the reader may consult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

[c] The life of JOACHIM was written in Italian by GREGORY DI LAURO, and published in 4to at *Naples* in the year 1660. The first edition of his prophecies was printed at *Venice* in the year 1517, and was followed by several new editions to satisfy the curiosity of the populace, great and small.

[(d) LANGTON was a learned and polite author for the age he lived in. It is to him we are indebted for the division of the Bible into chapters. He wrote *Commentaries* upon all the *Books of the Old Testament*, and upon *St. Paul's Epistles*.]

moral

C B N T. moral discourses, in which there are many wise and useful exhortations, and precepts [e];

XIII.

JACOBUS DE VITRIACO, who acquired a name by his *Oriental History*; and JACOBUS DE VORAGINE, whose *History of the Lombards* [f], was received with applause.

The writers of this century, who obtained the greatest renown on account of their laborious researches in, what was called, philosophical or dialectical theology, were, ALBERTUS MAGNUS, THOMAS AQUINAS, BONAVENTURA, who were, each of them, truly possessed of an inquisitive turn of mind, a sublime and penetrating genius, accompanied with an uncommon talent of founding the most hidden truths, and treating with facility the most abstruse subjects, though they are all chargeable with errors and reveries that do little honour to their memories [g]. The other writers, who trod the same intricate paths of metaphysical divinity, were many in number, and several of them justly admired, though much inferior in renown to the celebrated triumvirate now mentioned; such were ALEXANDER DE HALES, the interpreter of ARISTOTLE, WILLIAM of Paris [b], ROBERT CAPITO [i], THOMAS CANTIPRA-

[e] Several of the name of ALAN, lived in this century, who have been strangely confounded both by ancient and modern writers. See JAC. LE BOEUF, *Memoires sur l'Hist. d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 300. & *Dissert. sur l'Hist. Civil. et Eccles. de Paris*, tom. ii. p. 293.

[f] JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptor. Domin.* tom. i. p. 454.—BOLLANDI *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. p. 9.

[g] For an account of ALBERT, see ECHARD. *Script. Dom.* tom. i. p. 162.—For an account of THOMAS AQUINAS, who was called the *Angel of the scholastics* among other splendid titles, see the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. *Martii*, p. 655. & ANT. TURON, *Vie de St. Thomas*, Paris 1737, in 4to.—We have also a circumstantial relation of whatever concerns the life, writings, and exploits of BONAVENTURA, the tutelary saint of the *Lionnois* in France, in the two following books, viz. COLONIA, *Histoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 307.—and the *Histoire de la Vie et du Culte de S. Bonaventure par un Religieux Cordelier*, à Lyon, 1747, in 8vo.

[b] See the *Gallia Christiana*, published by the Benedictines, tom. vii. p. 95.

[i] The learned ANTHONY WOOD has given an ample account of ROBERT CAPITO, in his *Antiquitat. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 81. 105.

TENSIS, JOHN DE PECKHAM, WILLIAM DURAND, ROGER BACON [k], RICHARD MIDDLETON, ÆGIDIUS DE COLUMNA, ARMAND DE BELLO VISU, and several others.

HUGO DE St. CARO gained much applause by the *Concordance*, which he composed of the *Holy Bible* [l].

GUILLAUME DE St. AMOUR, carried on with great spirit and resolution, but with little success, a literary and theological war against the Mendicant friars, who looked upon begging as a mark of sanctity.

HUMBERT DE ROMANIS drew up a system of rules and precepts with a view to put under better regulation the lives and manners of the monastic orders.

GUILIELMUS PERALDUS arose in this century to the highest degree of literary renown, in consequence of a system of morals he published under the title of *Summa Virtutum et Vitiiorum* [m].

RAIMOND MARTIN yet survives the oblivion that has covered many of his cotemporaries, and his *Pugio Fidei*, or *Sword of Faith*, which he drew against the Jews and Saracens, has escaped the ruins of time.

JOHN of PARIS deserves an eminent rank among the glorious defenders of truth, liberty, and justice; since he maintained the authority of the civil powers, and the majesty of kings and princes, against the ambitious stratagems and usurpations of the Roman pontiffs, and declared openly his opposition to the opinion that was commonly adopted with respect to the sacrament

[(k) We are surprized to find ROGER BACON thrust here into a crowd of vulgar *literati*, since that great man, whose astonishing genius and universal learning have already been taken notice of, was, in every respect, superior to ALBERT and BONAVENTURA, two of the heroes of Dr. MOSHEIM's triumvirate.]

[(l) HUGO DE St. CARO, or *St. Cher*, composed also a very learned collection of the various readings of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuscripts of the Bible. This work, which he entitled *Correctorium Bibliæ*, is preserved in manuscript in the Sorbonne library. We must not forget to observe also that his *Concordance* is the first that ever was compiled.]

[m] See COLONIA, *Histoire Litt. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 322.

C E N T. of the Lord's supper, and the presence of CHRIST in
XIII. that holy ordinance [n].

C H A P. III.

*Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church during
this century.*

The general
state of re-
ligion.

I. **H**OWEVER numerous and deplorable the corruptions and superstitious abuses were that had hitherto reigned in the church, and deformed the beautiful simplicity of the gospel, they were nevertheless increased in this century, instead of being reformed, and the religion of CHRIST continued to suffer under the growing tyranny of fanaticism and superstition. The progress of reason and truth was retarded among the Greeks and Orientals by their immoderate aversion to the Latins, their blind admiration of whatever bore the stamp of antiquity, the indolence of their bishops, the stupidity of their clergy, and the calamities of the times. Among the Latins many concurring causes united to augment the darkness of that cloud that had already been cast over the divine lustre of genuine Christianity. On the one hand, the Roman pontiffs could not bear the thoughts of any thing that might have the remotest tendency to diminish their authority, or to encroach upon their prerogatives; and therefore they laboured assiduously to keep the multitude in the dark, and to blast every attempt that was made towards a reformation in the doctrine or discipline of the church. On the other hand, the school-divines, among whom the Dominicans and Franciscan monks made the greatest figure on account of their unintelligible jargon and subtilty, shed perplexity and darkness over the plain truths of religion by their intricate distinctions and end-

[n] We may learn his opinion concerning the eucharist from his treatise, entitled, *Determinatio de S. Coena*, and published in 8vo at London, by the learned Dr. ALIX, in the year 1686.—See also ECHARDI *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i. p. 501.—BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionens.* tom. i. p. 4. 576, 577.

less divisions, and by that cavilling, quibbling, disputatious spirit, that is the mortal enemy both of truth and virtue. It is true, that these scholastic doctors were not all equally chargeable with corrupting the truth; the most enormous and criminal corruptors of Christianity were those who led the multitude into the two following abominable errors: that it was in the power of man to perform, if he pleased, a more perfect obedience than God required, and that the whole of religion consisted in an external air of gravity, and in certain composed bodily gestures.

II. It will be easy to confirm this general account of the state of religion by particular facts. In the IV council of the Lateran that was held by INNOCENT III, in the year 1215, at which such a prodigious number of ecclesiastics were assembled [o], that imperious and insolent pontiff, without deigning to consult any body, published no less than seventy laws or decrees, by which not only the authority of the popes and the power of the clergy were confirmed and extended, but also new doctrines, or *articles of faith*, were imposed upon Christians. Hitherto the opinions of the Christian doctors, concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of CHRIST were *present* in the eucharist, were extremely different, nor had the church determined by any clear and positive decree the sentiment that was to be embraced in relation to that important matter. It was reserved for INNOCENT to put an end to the liberty, which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to the declarations of scripture, and to decide in favour of the most monstrous doctrine, that the frenzy of superstition was capable of inventing. This audacious pontiff pronounced the opinion that is embraced at this day in the church of *Rome* relating to that point, to be the only true orthodox account of the matter, and he *had the honour* of introducing and establishing the use of the term *Transubstantiation*, which was hither-

CENT.
XIII.

New articles
of faith im-
posed by In-
nocent III.

[(o) At this council there were present 412 bishops, 800 abbots and priors, besides the ambassadors of almost all the European princes.]

CENT.
XIII.

to absolutely unknown [p]. The same pontiff placed, by his own authority, among the duties prescribed by the divine laws, that of *auricular confession* to a priest; a confession that implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also a particular enumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent. Before this period several doctors, indeed, looked upon this kind of *confession*, as a duty inculcated by divine authority; but this opinion was not publicly received as the doctrine of the church. For though the confession of sins was justly looked upon as an essential duty, yet it was left to every Christian's choice, to make this confession mentally to the supreme Being, or to express it in words to a spiritual confidant and director [q]. These two laws, which, by the authority of INNOCENT, were received as laws of God, and adopted, of consequence, as laws of the church, occasioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even the smallest traces are to be found in the sacred writings, or in the apostolic and primitive ages, and which were much more adapted to establish and extend the reign of superstition, than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuses of which it had been the source.

The sect of
the Flagel-
lantes, or
Whippers.

III. There is nothing that will contribute more to convince us of the miserable state of religion in this century, and of the frenzy that almost generally prevailed in the devotion of these unhappy times, than the rise of the sect, called *Flagellantes*, or *Whippers*, which sprung up in *Italy* in the year 1260, and was propagated from thence thro' almost all the countries of *Europe*. The societies, that embraced this new discipline, presented the most hideous and shocking spectacle, that can well be conceived; they ran in multitudes, composed of persons of both sexes, and of all ranks and ages, through the public places of the most populous cities, and also through the fields and deserts, with whips in their hands, lashing their naked bodies with the most astonishing severity, filling the air with their wild shrieks, and beholding the firmament with an air of distraction, ferocity, and horror, and all this

[p] See EDM. ALBERTINUS, *De Eucharistia*, lib. iii. p. 972.

[q] See the book of the learned DAILLE, concerning *Auricular Confession*.

with a view to obtain the divine mercy for themselves, and others by their voluntary mortification and penance [r].

CENT.
XIII.

This method of appeasing the Deity was perfectly conformable to the notions concerning religion that generally prevailed in this century; nor did these fanatical *Whippers* do any thing more in this extravagant discipline, than practise the lessons they had received from the monks, especially from those of the Mendicant orders. Hence they attracted the esteem and veneration not only of the populace, but also of their rulers, and were honoured and revered by all ranks and orders on account of their extraordinary sanctity and virtue. Their sect, however, did not continue always in the same high degree of credit and reputation; for though the primitive *Whippers* were exemplary in point of morals, yet their societies were augmented, as might naturally be expected, by a turbulent and furious rabble, many of whom were infected with the most ridiculous and impious opinions. Hence both the emperors and pontiffs thought proper to put an end to this religious frenzy, by declaring all devout *whipping* contrary to the divine law, and prejudicial to the soul's eternal interests.

IV. The Christian interpreters and commentators of this century, differ very little from those of the preceding times. The greatest part of them pretended to draw from the depths of truth (or rather of their imaginations) what they called the *Internal juice and marrow* of the scriptures, i. e. their hidden and mysterious sense; and this they did with so little dexterity, so little plausibility and invention, that the most of their explanations must appear insipid and nauseous to such as are not entirely destitute of judgment and taste. If our readers are desirous of a proof of the justice of this censure, or curious to try the extent of their patience,

The method of interpreting and explaining the scriptures little altered in this century.

[r] CHRIST. SCHOTGENII *Historia Flagellantium*.—JAQUES BOILEAU, *Histoire des Flagellans*, chap. ix. p. 253. We have also a lively picture of this fanatical discipline of the *Whippers*, exhibited in MARTENE'S *Voyage Littéraire de deux Bénédictins*, tom. ii. p. 105. with which the reader may compare MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. vi. p. 469.

CENT.
XIII.

they have only to peruse the explications that have been given by archbishop LANGTON, HUGH DE ST. CHER and ANTONY of *Padua*, of the various books of the *Old and New Testament*. The *Mystic* doctors carried this visionary method of interpreting scripture to the greatest height, and displayed the most laborious industry, or rather the most egregious folly, in searching for mysteries, where reason and common sense could find nothing but plain and evident truths. They were too *penetrating and quick-sighted* not to perceive clearly in the holy scriptures all those doctrines that were agreeable to their idle and fantastic system. Nor were their adversaries the *school-men* entirely averse to this arbitrary and fanciful manner of interpretation: though their principal industry was employed rather in collecting the explications given by the ancient doctors than in inventing new ones, as appear from the writings of ALEXANDER HALES, GUILIELMUS ALVERNUS, and THOMAS AQUINAS himself. We must not, however, omit observing, that the scholastic doctors in general, and more especially these now mentioned, had recourse often to the subtilties of logic and metaphysic to assist them in their explications of the sacred writings. To facilitate the study and interpretation of these divine books, HUGH DE ST. CHER composed his *Concordance* [s], and the Dominicans, under the eye of their supreme chief the learned JORDAN, gave a new edition of the Latin translation of the Bible, carefully revised and corrected from the ancient copies [t]. The Greeks contributed nothing that deserves attention, towards the illustration of the Holy Scriptures, the greatest part of which were expounded with great learning by GREGORY ABULPHARAIUS, that famous Syrian, whose erudition was famous throughout all the east, and whom we have already had occasion to mention in the course of the history [u].

[s] See ECHARDI *Scriptor. Ord. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 194.[t] RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Eccles.* p. 101.
M. DU PIN.[u] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 27.

V. Systems of theology and morals were multiplied CENT. XIII.
 exceedingly in this century, and the number of those
 writers who treated of the divine perfections and wor-
 ship, and of the practical rules of virtue and obedi-
 ence, is too great to permit our mentioning them par-
 ticularly. All such as were endowed with any confi-
 derable degree of genius and eloquence employed
 their labours upon these noble branches of sacred sci-
 ence, more especially the academical and public teach-
 ers, among whom the Dominicans and Franciscans held
 the most eminent rank. It is, indeed, neither necessary
 to mention the names, nor to enumerate the produc-
 tions of these doctors, since whoever is acquainted with
 the characters and writings of ALBERT the Great, and
 THOMAS AQUINAS, will know every thing that is
 worthy of note in the rest who were no more than
 their echoes. The latter of these two truly great men,
 who was commonly called the *Angel of the schools*, or
 the *Angelic Doctor*, sat unrivalled at the head of the di-
 vines of this century, and deservedly obtained the prin-
 cipal place among those who digested the doctrines
 of Christianity into a regular system, and illustrat-
 ed and explained them in a scientific manner. For no
 sooner had his system or *sum* of theology and morals
 seen the light, than it was received universally with
 the highest applause, placed in the same rank with the
 famous *Book of Sentences* of PETER LOMBARD, and ad-
 mitted as the standard of truth and the great rule ac-
 cording to which the public teachers formed their plans
 of instruction, and the youth their method of study.
 Certain writers, indeed, have denied that THOMAS
 was the author of the celebrated system that bears his
 name [w]; but the reasons they alledge in support of
 this notion are utterly destitute of evidence and soli-
 dity [x].

The state of
 the didactic
 theology.

[w] See JO. LAUNOII *Traditio Ecclesiæ circa Simoniam*, p. 290.

[x] See NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xiii.* p. 391.—
 ECHARD and QUETIF, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. Sæc. xiii.* tom. i.
 p. 293.—ANT. TOURON, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 604.

CENT.

XIII.

The scholastic doctors, for the most part, *Realists* *.

VI. The greatest part of these doctors followed ARISTOTLE as their model, and made use of the logical and metaphysical principles of that subtle philosopher in illustrating the doctrines of Christianity and removing the difficulties with which some of them were attended. In their philosophical explications of the more sublime truths of that divine religion they followed the hypothesis of the *Realists*, which sect, in this century, was much more numerous and flourishing than that of the *Nominalists*, on account of the lustre and credit it derived from the authority of THOMAS AQUINAS and ALBERT, its learned and venerable patrons. Yet notwithstanding all the subtilty and penetration of these *irrefragable, seraphic, and angelic* doctors, as they were commonly styled, they often appeared wiser in their own conceit, than they were in reality, and frequently did little more than involve in greater obscurity, the doctrines which they pretended to place in the clearest light. For not to mention the ridiculous oddity of many of their expressions, the hideous barbarity of their style, and their extravagant and presumptuous desire of prying into matters that infinitely surpass the comprehension of short-sighted mortals, they were chargeable with defects in their manner of reasoning, which every true philosopher will, of all others, be most careful to avoid. For they neither defined their terms accurately, and hence arose innumerable disputes merely about words; nor did they divide their subject with perspicuity and precision, and hence they generally treated it in a confused and unsatisfactory manner. The great *Angelic Doctor* himself, notwithstanding his boasted method, was defective in these respects; his definitions are often vague, or obscure, and his plans or divisions, though full of art, are frequently destitute of clearness and proportion.

[* In the original we find *Positivi* in the margin, which is manifestly a fault; since the *Positivi* were quite opposite in their method of teaching, to the school men, and were the same with *Biblici* mentioned in the following section. See above CENT. XII. P. II. CH. III. § VIII.]

VII. The

VII. The method of investigating divine truth by CENT. XIII. reason and philosophy prevailed so universally and was followed with such ardor, that the number of those, The number of compilers, or Biblicists*, greatly diminished. who, in conformity with the example of the ancient doctors, drew their systems of theology from the holy scriptures and the writings of the fathers, and who acquired on that account the name of *Biblicists*, diminished from day to day. It is true, indeed, that several persons of eminent piety [y], and even some of the Roman pontiffs [z], exhorted, with great seriousness and warmth, the *scholastic* divines; and more especially those of the university of *Paris*, to change their method of teaching theology, and, laying aside their philosophical abstraction and subtilty, to deduce the sublime science of salvation from the holy scriptures with that purity and simplicity, with which it was there delivered by the inspired writers. But these admonitions and exhortations were without effect; the evil was become too inveterate to admit of a remedy, and the passion for logic and metaphysic was grown so universal and so violent, that neither remonstrances nor arguments could check its presumption, or allay its ardor. In justice, however, to the scholastic doctors it is necessary to observe, that they did not neglect the dictates of the gospel, nor the authority of tradition; though what they drew from these two sources proves sufficiently that they had studied neither with much attention or

[y] See DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 9. 129. 180.
—ANT. WOOD, *Antiqq. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 91, 92. 94.

[z] See the famous epistle of GREGORY IX to the professors in the university of *Paris*, published in DU BOULAY'S *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 129. The pontiff concludes that remarkable epistle with the following words: *Mandamus et striete præcipimus, quatenus sine sermone mundanæ scientiæ, doceatis Theologicam puritatem, non adulterantes verbum Dei Philosophorum figmentis . . . sed contenti terminis a patribus institutis mentis auditorum vestrorum fructu cælestis eloquii saginetis ut hauriant a fontibus salvatoris.*

[* In the margin of the original, instead of *Biblicists* which we find in the text, Dr. MOSHEIM has wrote *Sententiarum*, which is undoubtedly an oversight. The *Sententiarum* or followers of PETER LOMBARD, who is considered as the father of the scholastic philosophy, are to be placed in the same class with the philosophical divines, mentioned in the preceding section, and were quite opposite to the *Biblici*, both in their manner of thinking and teaching. See above CENT. XII. P. II. CH. III. VIII.

CENT. application of mind [a] And it is moreover certain, XIII. that, in process of time, they committed to others the care of consulting the sources now mentioned, and reserved to themselves the much respected province of philosophy, and the intricate mazes of dialectical chicanery. And, indeed, independent of their philosophical vanity, we may assign another reason for this method of proceeding drawn from the nature of their profession, and the circumstances in which they were placed. For the greatest part of these subtle doctors were Dominican or Franciscan friars; and as the monks of these Orders had no possessions, not even libraries, and led, besides, wandering and itinerant lives, such of them as were ambitious of literary fame, and of the honours of authorship, were, for the most part, obliged to draw their materials from their own genius and memory, being destitute of all other succours.

Much opposition made to the scholastic doctors.

VIII. The opinions which these philosophical divines instilled into the minds of the youth appeared to the votaries of the ancient fathers highly dangerous, and even pernicious, and hence they used their utmost efforts to stop the progress of these opinions and to diminish the credit and influence of their authors. Nor was their opposition at all ill grounded; for the subtle doctors of the school not only explained the mysteries of religion in a manner conformable to the principles of their presumptuous logic, and modified them according to the imperious dictates of their imperfect reason, but also propagated the most impious sentiments and tenets concerning the supreme Being, the material world, the origin of the universe, and the nature of the soul. And when it was objected to these sentiments and tenets, that they were in direct contradiction to the genius of Christianity and to the express doctrines of scripture, these scholastic quibblers had recourse, for a reply, or rather for a method of escape, to that perfidious distinction, which has

[a] FAYDIT *Alteration du Dogme Theologique par la Philosophie d'Aristote*, p. 289.—RICHARD SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccles.* par M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 170. 187.

been frequently employed by modern deists, that these tenets were *philosophically true*, and conformable to right reason, but that they were, indeed, *theologically false*, and contrary to the orthodox faith. This kindled an open war between the *Biblicists*, or Bible-divines, and the scholastic doctors, which was carried on with great warmth throughout the whole course of this century; particularly in the universities of *Oxford* and *Paris*, where we find the former loading the latter with the heaviest reproaches in their public acts, and in their Polemic writings, and accusing them of corrupting the doctrines of the gospel, both in their public lessons, and in their private discourse [b]. Even St. THOMAS himself was accused of holding opinions contrary to the truth; his orthodoxy, at least, was looked upon as extremely dubious by many of the Parisian doctors [c]. He accordingly saw a formidable scene of opposition arising against him, but had the good fortune to conjure the storm, and to escape untouched. Others, whose authority was less extensive and their names less respectable, were treated with more severity. The living were obliged to confess publicly their errors, and the dead, who had persevered in them to the last, had their memories branded with infamy.

IX. But the most formidable adversaries the scholastic doctors had to encounter were the *Mystics*, who, rejecting every thing that had the least resemblance of argumentation or dispute about matters of doctrine and opinion, confined their endeavours to the advancement of inward piety, and the propagation of devout and tender feelings, and thus acquired the highest degree of popularity. The people, who are much more affected with what touches their passions, than with what

The Mystics oppose the schoolmen.

[b] See MATTH. PARIS, *Hist. Major*, p. 541.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. iii. p. 397. 430. 433. 472, &c.

[c] See Jo. LAUNOII *Hist. Gymnas. Navarreni*, part. III. lib. iii. cap. cxvi. tom. iv. Opp. part. I. p. 485.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. tom. iv. p. 204.—PETRI ZORNII. *Opuscula Sacra*, tom. i. p. 445.—R. SIMON, *Lettres Choïsies*, tom. ii. p. 266.—ECHARDI *Scrip-tor. Ordin. Prædicator*. tom. i. p. 435.

C B N T.
XIII.

is only address'd to their reason, were attach'd to the *Myſtics* in the warmeſt manner; and this gave ſuch weight to the reproaches and inveſtives which they threw out againſt the *ſchool-men*, that the latter thought it more prudent to diſarm theſe favourites of the multitude by mild and ſubmiſſive meaſures, than to return their reproaches with indignation and bitterneſs. They accordingly ſet themſelves to flatter the *Myſtics*, and not only extoll'd their *ſentimental* ſyſtem, but employ'd their pens in illuſtrating and defending it; nay, they associat-ed it with the ſcholastic philoſophy, though they were as different from each other as any two things could poſſibly be. It is well known that BONAVENTURA, ALBERT the great, ROBERT CAPITO, and THOMAS AQUINAS contributed to this reconciliation between Myſticism and Dialec'tics by their learned labours, and even went ſo far as to write commentaries upon DIONYSIUS, the chief of the Myſtics, whom theſe ſubtile doctors probably look'd upon with a ſecret contempt.

The ſtate of
Chriſtian
morality.

X. Both the ſchool-men and Myſtics of this century treated, in their writings, of the obligations of morality, the duties of the Chriſtian life, and of the means that were moſt adapted to preſerve or deliver the ſoul from the ſervitude and contagion of vice; but their methods of handling theſe important ſubjects, were, as may be eaſily conceived, entirely different. We may form an idea of myſtical morality from the *Observations of GEORGE PACHYMERIS upon the writings of Dionyſius*, and from the *Spiritual Inſtitutes or Abridgment of Myſtic Theology*, compos'd by HUMBERT DE ROMANIS, of which productions the firſt was written in Greek, and the ſecond in Latin. As to the ſcholastic moralists, they were principally employ'd in defining the nature of virtue and vice in general, and the characters of the various virtues and vices in particular; and hence the prodigious number of *ſums* or ſyſtematical collections, of *virtues and vices*, that appear'd in this century. The ſchool men divid'd the virtues into two claſſes. The firſt comprehend'd the *moral* virtues, which differ, in no reſpect from thoſe which ARISTOTLE recommended

to

to his disciples. The second contained the theological virtues, which, in consequence of what St. PAUL, says, I *Corinthb.* xiii. 13. they made to consist in *Faith, Hope, and Charity*. In explaining and illustrating the nature of the virtues comprehended in these two classes, they seemed rather to have in view the pleasure of disputing than the design of instructing, and they exhausted all their subtilty in resolving difficulties which were of their own creation. THOMAS AQUINAS shone forth as a star of the first magnitude, though, like the others, he was often covered with impenetrable fogs. The second part of his famous *sum* was wholly employed in laying down the principles of morality, and in deducing and illustrating the various duties that result from them; and this part of his learned labours has had the honour and misfortune of passing through the hands of a truly prodigious number of commentators.

XI. It is absolutely necessary to observe here, that the moral writers of this and the following centuries must be read with the utmost caution; and with a perpetual attention to this circumstance, that though they employ the same terms that we find in the sacred writings, yet they use them in a quite different sense from that which they bear in these divine books. They speak of justice, charity, faith, and holiness; but as these virtues are illustrated by these quibbling sophists, they differ much from the amiable, and sublime duties, which CHRIST and his disciples have inculcated under the same denominations. A single example will be sufficient to render this evident beyond contradiction. A *pious* and *holy* man, according to the sense annexed by our Saviour to these terms, is one, who consecrates his affections and actions to the service of the supreme Being, and accounts it his highest honour and felicity, as well as his indispensable duty to obey his laws. But, in the style of the moral writers of this age, he was a *pious* and *holy* man, who deprived himself of his possessions to enrich the priesthood, to build churches, and found monasteries, and whose faith and obedience were so implicitly

An important remark relating to the manner of treating morals, in this century.

CENT.
XIII.

explicitly enslaved to the imperious dictates of the Roman pontiffs, that he believed and acted without examination, as these lordly directors thought proper to prescribe. Nor were the ideas which these writers entertained concerning *justice*, at all conformable to the nature of that virtue, as it is described in the holy scriptures, since in their opinion it was lawful to injure, revile, torment, persecute, and even put to death, a *Heretic*, i. e. any person who refused to obey blindly the decrees of the pontiffs, or to believe all the absurdities, which they imposed upon the credulity of the multitude.

The state of
polemic or
controversial
theology.

XII. The writers of controversy in this century were more numerous than respectable. NICETAS ACOMINATUS, who made a considerable figure among the Greeks, attacked all the different sects in his work entitled, *The Treasure of the Orthodox Faith*; but he combated after the Grecian manner, and defended the cause he undertook to maintain, rather by the decrees of councils, and the decision of the fathers, than by the dictates of reason and the authority of scripture. RAYMOND of PENNAFORT was one of the first among the Latins who abandoned the unchristian method of converting infidels by the force of arms and the terrors of capital punishments, and who undertook to vanquish the Jews and Saracens by reason and argument [d]. This engaged in the same controversy a considerable number of able disputants, who were acquainted with the Hebrew and Arabic languages, among whom RAYMOND MARTIN, the celebrated author of the *Sword of Faith* [e], is unquestionably entitled to the first rank. THOMAS AQUINAS, also, appeared with dignity among the Christian champions, and his book against the Gentiles [f], is far from being contemptible; nor ought we to omit mentioning

[d] ECHARD & QUETIF in *Scriptoribus Ordinis Prædicator.* tom. i. § xiii. p. 106.

[e] BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article MARTINI.—PAULI COLOME-
311 *Hispania Orient.* p. 209.

[f] JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Deleß. Argumentorum et Scriptor. pro
veritate Relig. Christian.* p. 270.

a learned

a learned work of ALAN DE L'ISLE, which was designed CENT. XIII.
to refute the objections of both Jews and Pagans [g].

The writers, who handled other more particular branches of theological controversy, were far inferior to these now mentioned in genius and abilities, and their works seemed less calculated to promote the truth, than to render their adversaries odious.

XIII. The grand controversy between the Greek and Latin church was still carried on, and all the efforts that were made, during this century, to bring it to a conclusion, one way or another, proved ineffectual. GREGORY IX. employed the ministry of the Franciscan monks to bring about an accommodation with the Greeks, and pursued with zeal this laudable purpose from the year 1232 to the end of his pontificate, but without the least appearance of success [b]. INNOCENT IV. embarked in the same undertaking in the year 1247, and sent JOHN of PARMA, with other Franciscan friars, to *Nice* for the same purpose; while the Grecian pontiff came in person to *Rome*, and was declared legate of the *Apostolic see* [i]. But these previous acts of mutual civility and respect, which could not but excite the hopes of such as longed for the conclusion of these unhappy discords, did not terminate in the reconciliation that was expected. New incidents arose to blast the influence of these salutary measures, and the flame of dissension recovered new vigour. Under the pontificate of URBAN IV. the aspect of things changed for the better, and the negotiations for peace were renewed with such success, as promised a speedy conclusion of these unhappy divisions. For MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS had no sooner driven the Latins out of *Constantinople*, than he sent ambassadors to *Rome* to declare his pacific intentions, that thus he might establish his disputed dominion,

The controversy between the Greeks and Latins continued.

[g] *Liber contra Judæos et Paganos.*

[b] See WADDING, *Annal. Minor.* tom. ii. p. 279. 296. & ECHARD, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 103. 911.—Add to these MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major*, p. 386.

[i] See BALUZII *Miscellan.* tom. vii. p. 370. 388. 393. 397. 497. 498.—WADDING, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. & iv. p. 37.

and

CENT.
XIII.

and gain over the Roman pontiff to his side [k]. But during the course of these negotiations, URBAN's death left matters unfinished, and suspended once more the hopes and expectations of the public. Under the pontificate of GREGORY X, proposals of peace were again made by the same emperor, who, after much opposition from his own clergy, sent ambassadors to the council that was assembled at *Lions* in the year 1274 [l], and there, with the solemn consent of JOHN VECCUS, patriarch of *Constantinople*, and several Greek bishops publicly agreed to the terms of accommodation proposed by the Roman pontiff [m]. This reunion, however, was not durable; for the situation of affairs in *Greece* and *Italy* being changed some years after this convention, and that in such a manner, as to deliver the former from all apprehensions of a Latin invasion, ANDRONICUS, the son of MICHAEL, assembled a council at *Constantinople*, in the palace of *Blachernæ*, A. D. 1284, in which, by a solemn decree, this ignominious treaty was declared entirely null, and the famous VECCUS, by whose persuasion and authority it had been concluded, was sent into exile [n]. This resolute measure, as may

[k] WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 181. 201. 223. 269: 303.

[l] See WADDING. *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 343. 371. tom. v. p. 9. 29. 62.—COLONIA, *Hist. Litter. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 284.

[m] JOSEPH, and not VECCUS, was patriarch of *Constantinople* when this treaty was concluded. The former had bound himself by a solemn oath never to consent to a reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches; for which reason the emperor, when he sent his ambassador to *Lions*, proposed to JOSEPH the following alternative: that, if they succeeded in bringing about an accommodation, he should renounce his patriarchal dignity, but, if they failed in their attempt, he was to remain patriarch, advising him, at the same time, to retire to a convent, until the matter was decided. The ambassadors succeeded, JOSEPH was deposed, and VECCUS elected in his place; when, and not before, this latter ratified the treaty in question by his solemn consent to the ignominious article of *supremacy* and *pre-eminence*, which it confirmed to the Roman pontiff.]

[n] LEO ALLATIUS *de perpetua consensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. c. xv, xvi. p. 727.—FRID. SPANHEIM *de perpet. dissensione Græcor. et Latin.* tom. ii. Opp. p. 488, &c.

well be imagined, rendered the divisions more violent than they had been before the treaty now mentioned; and it was also followed by an open schism, and by the most unhappy discords among the Grecian clergy.

CENT.
XIII.

XIV. We pass over several controversies of a more private kind and of inferior moment, which have nothing in their nature or circumstances that deserve the attention of the curious; but we must not forget to observe, that the grand dispute concerning the eucharist was still continued in this century, not only in *France*, but in several other places. For, though INNOCENT III had, in the council held at the Lateran in the year 1215, presumptuously taken upon him to place *Transubstantiation* among the avowed doctrines of the Latin church, yet the authority of this decree was called in question by many, and several divines had the courage to maintain the probability of the opinions that were opposed to that monstrous doctrine. Those who, adopting the sentiments of BERENGER, considered the bread and wine in no other light, than as signs or symbols of the body and blood of CHRIST, did not venture either to defend or profess this opinion in a public manner. Many, also, thought it sufficient to acknowledge, what was termed, a *real presence*, though they explained the manner of this presence quite otherwise than the doctrine of INNOCENT had defined it [o]. Among these, JOHN, surnamed PUNGENS ASINUS, a subtile doctor of the university of *Paris*, acquired an eminent and distinguished name, and, without incurring the censure of his superiors, substituted *Consubstantiation* in the place of *Transubstantiation* towards the conclusion of this century [p].

The disputes
concerning
the presence
of Christ's
body in the
eucharist
continued.

[o] PET. ALLIX, *Præf. ad F. Johannis Determinat. de Sacramento Altaris*, published at London in 8vo in the year 1686.

[p] The book of this celebrated doctor was published by the learned ALLIX above-mentioned. See BALUZII *Vitæ Pontiff. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 576.—DACHERII *Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor.* tom. iii. p. 58.—ECHARDI *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 561.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

Rites multiplied.

I. IT would be endless to enumerate the additions that were made in this century to the external part of divine worship, in order to increase its pomp and render it more striking. These additions were owing partly to the public edicts of the Roman pontiffs, and partly to the private injunctions of the Sacerdotal and Monastic orders, who shared the veneration, which was excited in the multitude by the splendor and magnificence of this religious spectacle. Instead of mentioning these additions, we shall only observe in general, that religion was now become a sort of a rareeshow through the *admirable wisdom* of the rulers of the church, who, to render its impressions more deep and lasting, thought proper to exhibit it in a striking manner, to the external senses. For this purpose at certain stated times, and especially upon the more illustrious festivals, the miraculous dispensations of the divine wisdom in favour of the church, and the more remarkable events in the Christian history, were represented under certain allegorical figures and images, or rather in a kind of mimic shew [q]. But these scenic representations, in which there was a motley mixture of mirth and gravity, these tragi-comical spectacles, though they amused and affected in a certain manner the gazing populace, were highly detrimental, instead of being useful to the cause of religion; they degraded its dignity, and furnished abundant matter of laughter to its enemies.

The rites instituted in relation to the eucharist.

II. It will not appear surprising that the bread, consecrated in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, became

[q] It is probable enough that this licentious custom of exhibiting mimic representations of religious objects derived its origin from the Mendicant friars.

the

the object of religious worship; for this was the natural consequence of the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. But the effects of that impious and ridiculous doctrine did not end here; it produced all that train of ceremonies and institutions that are still used in the church of *Rome* in honour of that *deified* bread, as they blasphemously call it. Hence those rich and splendid receptacles, that were formed for the residence of God under this new shape [r], and the lamps and other precious ornaments that were designed to beautify this habitation of the Deity. And hence the custom that still prevails, of carrying about this *divine bread* in solemn pomp through the public streets, when it is to be administered to sick or dying persons, with many other ceremonies of a like nature which are dishonourable to religion, and opprobrious to humanity. But that which gave the finishing touch to this heap of absurdities, and displayed superstition in its highest extravagance, was the institution of the celebrated annual *Festival of the Holy Sacrament*, or, as it is sometimes called, of the *body of Christ* whose origin was as follows: A certain devout woman, whose name was JULIANA, and who lived at *Liege*, declared that she had received a revelation from heaven intimating to her, that it was the will of God, that a peculiar festival should be annually observed in honour of the *holy sacrament*, or rather of the *real presence* of CHRIST's body in that sacred institution. Few gave attention or credit to this pretended vision, whose

CENT.
XIII.

[(r) This blasphemous language which Dr. MOSHEIM is obliged to use in representing the absurdities of the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, is nothing in comparison with the impious figures that were made use of by the abettors of that monstrous tenet to accommodate it, in some measure, to the capacities of the multitude. We need not wonder that the Pagans metamorphosed their JUPITER into a *bull*, a *swan*, and other such figures, when we see the rulers of the Christian church transforming the *Sop* of God into a piece of bread; a transformation so vile, and, even were it not vile, so useless, that it is inconceivable how it could enter into the head of any mortal, and equally so, how the bishops of *Rome* could confide so far in the credulity of the people as to risk their authority by propagating such a doctrine.]

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

Rites multiplied.

I. IT would be endless to enumerate the additions that were made in this century to the external part of divine worship, in order to increase its pomp and render it more striking. These additions were owing partly to the public edicts of the Roman pontiffs, and partly to the private injunctions of the Sacerdotal and Monastic orders, who shared the veneration, which was excited in the multitude by the splendor and magnificence of this religious spectacle. Instead of mentioning these additions, we shall only observe in general, that religion was now become a sort of a rareeshow through the *admirable wisdom* of the rulers of the church, who, to render its impressions more deep and lasting, thought proper to exhibit it in a striking manner, to the external senses. For this purpose at certain stated times, and especially upon the more illustrious festivals, the miraculous dispensations of the divine wisdom in favour of the church, and the more remarkable events in the Christian history, were represented under certain allegorical figures and images, or rather in a kind of mimic shew [q]. But these scenic representations, in which there was a motley mixture of mirth and gravity, these tragi-comical spectacles, though they amused and affected in a certain manner the gazing populace, were highly detrimental, instead of being useful to the cause of religion; they degraded its dignity, and furnished abundant matter of laughter to its enemies.

The rites instituted in relation to the eucharist.

II. It will not appear surprising that the bread, consecrated in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, became

[q] It is probable enough that this licentious custom of exhibiting mimic representations of religious objects derived its origin from the Mendicant friars.

the

the object of religious worship; for this was the natural consequence of the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. But the effects of that impious and ridiculous doctrine did not end here; it produced all that train of ceremonies and institutions that are still used in the church of *Rome* in honour of that *deified* bread, as they blasphemously call it. Hence those rich and splendid receptacles, that were formed for the residence of God under this new shape [*r*], and the lamps and other precious ornaments that were designed to beautify this habitation of the Deity. And hence the custom that still prevails, of carrying about this *divine bread* in solemn pomp through the public streets, when it is to be administered to sick or dying persons, with many other ceremonies of a like nature which are dishonourable to religion, and opprobrious to humanity. But that which gave the finishing touch to this heap of absurdities, and displayed superstition in its highest extravagance, was the institution of the celebrated annual *Festival of the Holy Sacrament*, or, as it is sometimes called, of the *body of Christ* whose origin was as follows: A certain devout woman, whose name was JULIANA, and who lived at *Liege*, declared that she had received a revelation from heaven intimating to her, that it was the will of God, that a peculiar festival should be annually observed in honour of the *holy sacrament*, or rather of the *real presence* of CHRIST's body in that sacred institution. Few gave attention or credit to this pretended vision, whose

[(*r*) This blasphemous language which Dr. MOSHEIM is obliged to use in representing the absurdities of the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, is nothing in comparison with the impious figures that were made use of by the abettors of that monstrous tenet to accommodate it, in some measure, to the capacities of the multitude. We need not wonder that the Pagans metamorphosed their JUPITER into a *bull*, a *swan*, and other such figures, when we see the rulers of the Christian church transforming the *Sup* of God into a piece of bread; a transformation so vile, and even were it not vile, so useless, that it is inconceivable how it could enter into the head of any mortal, and equally so, how the bishops of *Rome* could confide so far in the credulity of the people as to risk their authority by propagating such a doctrine.]

CENT.
XIII.

circumstances were extremely equivocal and absurd [s], and which would have come to nothing, had it not been supported by ROBERT, bishop of *Liege*, who, in the year 1246, published an order for the celebration of this festival throughout the whole province, notwithstanding the opposition which he knew would be made to a proposal founded only on an idle dream. After the death of JULIANA, one of her friends and companions whose name was EVE, took up her cause with uncommon zeal, and had credit enough with URBAN IV to engage him to publish, in the year 1264, a solemn edict, by which the festival in question was imposed upon all the Christian churches without exception. This edict, however, did not produce its full and proper effect, on account of the death of the pontiff, which happened soon after its publication; so that the festival under consideration was not celebrated universally throughout the Latin churches before the pontificate of CLEMENT V [1], who, in the council, held at *Vienne* in *France*, in the year 1311, confirmed the edict of URBAN, and thus, in spite of all opposition, established a festival, which contributed more to render the doctrine of transubstantiation agreeable to the people, than the decree of the council of the Lateran under INNOCENT III, or than all the exhortations of his lordly successors.

The year of
jubilee ad-
ded to the
rites of the
church.

III. About the conclusion of this century BONIFACE VIII, added to the public rites and ceremonies of the

[(s) This fanatical woman declared, that as often as she addressed herself to God, or to the saints in prayer, she saw the full moon with a small defect or breach in it; and that, having long studied to find out the signification of this strange appearance, she was inwardly informed by the spirit, that the moon signified the church, and that the defect or breach was the want of an annual festival in honour of the holy sacrament.]

[1] See BARTHOL. FISEN, *Origo prima Festi Corporis CHRISTI ex Viso Sanctæ Virgini Julianæ oblato*, published in 8vo. at *Liege*, in the year 1619.—DALLÆUS, *De cultus religios. objecto*, p. 287.—*Acta Sanctor. April.* tom. i. p. 437. 903.—And above all BENEDICT. Pont. Max. *de Festis CHRISTI et Mariæ*, lib. i. c. xiii. p. 360. tom. x. Opp.

church,

church, the famous jubilee, which is still celebrated at Rome at a stated period with the utmost profusion of pomp and magnificence. In the year 1299, a rumour was spread abroad among the inhabitants of that city, that all such, as visited, within the limits of the following year, the church of *St. Peter*, should obtain the remission of all their sins, and, that this privilege was to be annexed to the performance of the same service, once every hundred years. BONIFACE no sooner heard of this, than he ordered strict inquiry to be made concerning the author and the foundation of this report, and the result of this inquiry was answerable to his views; for he was assured, by many testimonies worthy of credit [*u*] (say the Roman catholic historians) that, from the remotest antiquity, this important privilege of remission and indulgence was to be obtained by the services above-mentioned. No sooner had the pontiff received this information than he issued out an epistolary mandate, addressed to all Christians, in which he enacted it as a solemn law of the church, that those, who every hundredth or jubilee year, confessed their sins, and visited, with sentiments of contrition and repentance, the churches of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* at Rome, should obtain thereby the entire remission of their various

[[*u*] These *Testimonies worthy of credit* have never been produced by the Romish writers, unless we rank in that class, that of an old man who had completed his 107th year, and who being brought before BONIFACE VIII, declared (if we may believe the Abbé FLEURY) that his father, who was a common labourer, had assisted at the celebration of a jubilee an hundred years before that time. See FLEURY *Hist. Eccles.* towards the end of the xiiith century.—It is, however, a very unaccountable thing, if the institution of the jubilee year was not the invention of BONIFACE, that there should be neither in the acts of councils, nor in the records of history, nor in the writing of the learned, any trace, or the least mention of its celebration before the year 1300; this, with other reasons of an irresistible evidence, have persuaded some Roman catholic writers to consider the institution of the jubilee year, as the invention of this pontiff, who, to render it more respectable, pretended that it was of a much earlier date, See GHILIN. & VICTORELL apud BONANNI *Numism. Pontif. Rom.* tom. i. p. 22, 23.]

CENT.
XIII.

rious offences [w]. The successors of BONIFACE were not satisfied with adding a multitude of new rites and inventions, by way of ornaments, to this superstitious institution; but finding by experience that it added to the lustre and augmented the revenues of the Roman church, they rendered its return more frequent, and fixed its celebration to every five and twentieth year [x].

CHAP.

[w] So the matter is related by JAMES CAJETAN, cardinal of St. George, and nephew to BONIFACE, in his *Relatio de Centesimo seu Jubilæo anno*, which is published in his *Magna Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum*, tom. vi. p. 426. 440. and in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, tom. xxv. p. 267, nor is there any reason to believe that his account is erroneous and false, nor that BONIFACE acted the part of an impostor, from a principle of avarice, upon this occasion.

[N. B. It is not without astonishment that we hear Dr. MOSHEIM deciding in this manner with respect to the *good faith* of BONIFACE, and the *relation* of his nephew. The character of that wicked perfidious and ambitious pontiff is well known, and the *relation* of the cardinal of St. George, has been proved to be the most ridiculous, fabulous, motley piece of stuff that ever usurped the title of an historical record. See the excellent *Lettres de M. Chais sur les Jubiles* (that are mentioned more at large in the following note) tom. i. p. 53.]

[x] The various writers, who have treated of the institution of the Roman jubilee, are enumerated by JO. ALBERT FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* p. 316. Among the authors that may be added to this list, there is one whom we think it necessary to mention particularly, viz. the Reverend CHARLES CHAIS, whose *Lettres Historiques et Dogmatiques sur les Jubiles et des Indulgences*, were published at the Hague in three volumes 8vo. in the year 1751.

[These letters of Mr. CHAIS (minister of the French church at the Hague, and well known in the Republic of Letters) contain the most full and accurate account that has been ever given of the institution of the jubilee, and of the rise, progress, abuses, and enormities of the infamous traffic of indulgences. This account is judiciously collected from the best authors of antiquity, and from several curious records that have escaped the researches of other writers; it is also interspersed with curious, and sometimes ludicrous anecdotes that render the work equally productive of entertainment and instruction. In the first volume of these Letters the learned author lays open the nature and origin of the institution of the jubilee; he proves it to have been a human invention, which owed its *rise* to the avarice and ambition of the popes, and its credit to the ignorance and superstition of the people, and whose celebration was absolutely unknown before the thirteenth century, which is the true date of its origin. He takes notice of the various changes it under-

C H A P. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

I. **W**E have no account of any new sects that arose among the Greeks during this century. Those of the Nestorians and Jacobites, which were settled in the remoter regions of the east, and who equalled the Greeks in their aversion to the rites and jurisdiction of the Latin church, were frequently solicited, by the ministry of Franciscan and Dominican missionaries sent among them by the popes, to receive the Roman yoke. In the year 1246, INNOCENT IV used his utmost efforts to bring both these sects under his dominion; and in the year 1278, terms of accommodation were proposed by NICHOLAS IV to the Nestorians, and particularly to that branch of the sect which resided in the Northern

Nestorians
and Jacobites.

underwent with respect to the time of its celebration, the various colours with which the ambitious pontiffs covered it in order to render it respectable and alluring in the eyes of the multitude, and exposes these illusions by many convincing arguments, whose gravity is seasoned with an agreeable and temperate mixture of decent raillery. He proves, with the utmost evidence, that the papal jubilee is an imitation of the *Secular Games* that were celebrated with such pomp in Pagan Rome. He points out the gross contradictions that reign in the *bulls* of the different popes with respect to the nature of this institution and the time of its celebration. Nor does he pass over in silence the infamous traffic of indulgences, the worldly pomp and splendor, the crimes, debaucheries, and disorders of every kind that were observable at the return of each jubilee year. He lays also before the reader an historical view of all the jubilees that were celebrated from the pontificate of BONIFACE VIII, in the year 1300, to that of BENEDICT XIV, in 1750, with an entertaining account of the most remarkable adventures that happened among the pilgrims who repaired to Rome on these occasions. The second and third volumes of these interesting Letters treat of the *indulgences* that are administered in the church of Rome. In which their nature and origin are explained, the doctrine of the Roman catholic divines relating to them stated and refuted, the history of this impious traffic accurately laid down, and its enormities and pernicious effects circumstantially exposed with learning, perspicuity, and candour.]

CENT.
XIII.

parts of *Asia* [y]. The leading men both among the Nestorians and Jacobites seemed to give ear to the proposals that were made to them, and were by no means averse to a reconciliation with the church of *Rome*; but the prospect of peace soon vanished, and a variety of causes concurred to prolong the rupture.

The contests of the Roman pontiffs with various sects, whom they branded indiscriminately with the name of Heretics.

II. During the whole course of this century the Roman pontiffs carried on the most barbarous and inhuman persecution against, what they looked upon as *heretics*, i. e. against all those who called their pretended authority and jurisdiction in question, or taught doctrines different from those which were adopted and propagated by the church of *Rome*. For the sects of the *Catharists*, *Waldenses*, *Petrobrusians*, &c. gathered strength from day to day, spread imperceptibly throughout all *Europe*, assembled numerous congregations in *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, and *Germany*, and formed by degrees such a powerful party as rendered them formidable to the Roman pontiffs, and menaced the papal jurisdiction with a fatal revolution. To the ancient sects new factions were added, which, though they differed from each other in various respects, yet were all unanimously agreed in this one point, *viz.* "That the public, and established religion was a motley system of errors and superstition, and that the dominion which the popes had usurped over Christians, as also the authority they exercised in religious matters, were unlawful and tyrannical." Such were the notions propagated by the sectaries, who refuted the superstitions and impostures of the times by arguments drawn from the holy scriptures, and whose declamations against the power, the opulence, and the vices of the pontiffs and clergy were extremely agreeable to many princes and civil magistrates, who groaned under the usurpations of the sacred order. The pontiffs therefore considered themselves as obliged to have recourse to new and extraordinary methods of defeat-

[y] ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Annal. Eccles.* tom. xiii. ad A. 1247. § 32. & tom. xv. ad A. 1303. § 22. & ad A. 1304. § 23.—MATTH. PARIS, *Histor. Major.* p. 372.

ing and subduing enemies, who both by their number CENT.
XIII. and their rank were every way proper to fill them with terror.

III. The number of these dissenters from the church The rise of
the inquisition in Nar-
bonne Gaul. of *Rome* was no where greater than in *Narbonne Gaul* [z], and the countries adjacent, where they were received and protected, in a singular manner, by RAYMOND VI, earl of *Thoulouse*, and other persons of the highest distinction; and where the bishops, either through humanity or indolence, were so negligent and remiss in the prosecution of heretics, that the latter, laying aside all their fears, formed settlements, and multiplied prodigiously from day to day. INNOCENT III was soon informed of all these proceedings; and about the commencement of this century sent legates extraordinary into the southern provinces of *France* to do what the bishops had left undone, and to extirpate heresy, in all its various forms and modifications, without being at all scrupulous in using such methods as might be necessary to effect this salutary purpose. The persons charged with this ghostly commission were RAINIER [a], a Cistercian monk, PIERRE DE CASTELNAU [b], arch-deacon of *Maguelonne*, who became also afterwards a Cistercian friar. These eminent missionaries were followed by several others, among whom was the famous Spaniard DOMINIC, founder of the order of preachers, who, returning from *Rome* in the year 1206, fell in with these delegates, embarked in their cause, and laboured both by his exhortations and actions in the extirpation of heresy. These spiritual champions, who engaged in this expedition upon the sole authority of the pope, with-

[z] That part of *France* which, in ancient times, comprehended the provinces of *Savoy*, *Dauphiné*, *Provence*, and *Languedoc*.

[(a)] Instead of RAINIER, other historians mention one RAOUL, or RALPH, as the associate of PIERRE DE CASTELNAU. See FLEURY, *Histoire Eccles.* livr. lxxvi. § 12.]

[b] The greatest part of the Roman writers consider PIERRE DE CASTELNAU as the first *Inquisitor*. It will appear hereafter in what sense this assertion may be admitted. For an account of this legate, see the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. Martii, p. 411.

out

CENT.
XIII.

out either asking the advice or demanding the succours of the bishops, and who inflicted capital punishment upon such of the heretics as they could not convert by reason and argument, were distinguished in common discourse by the title of *Inquisitors*, and from them the formidable and odious tribunal called the *Inquisition*, derived its original.

The form of
the inquisition
settled.

IV. When this new set of heresy-hunters [c] had executed their commission, and purged the provinces to which they were sent of the greatest part of the enemies of the Roman faith, the pontiffs were so sensible of their excellent services, that they established missionaries of a like nature, or, in other words, placed *Inquisitors*, in almost every city whose inhabitants had the misfortune to be suspected of heresy, notwithstanding the reluctance which the people shewed to this new institution, and the violence with which they frequently expelled, and sometimes massacred these bloody officers of the popish hierarchy. The council held at *Tbolouse*, in the year 1229, by ROMANUS, cardinal of *St. Angelo*, and pope's legate, went still farther, and erected in every city a council of inquisitors consisting of one priest and three laymen [d]. This institution was, however, superseded, in the year 1233, by GREGORY IX, who entrusted the Dominicans, or preaching friars, with the important commission of discovering and bringing to judgment the heretics that were lurking in *France*, and in a formal epistle discharged the bishops from the burthen of that painful office [e]. Immediately after this, the bi-

[(c) The term of Heresy-hunters, for which the translator is responsible, will not seem absurd, when it is known, that the missionaries who were sent into the provinces of *France* to extirpate heresy, and the inquisitors who succeeded them were bound by an oath, not only to seek for the heretics in towns, houses, cellars, and other lurking places, but also in woods, caves, fields, &c.]

[d] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. vii. p. 175.

[e] BERNHARD. GUIDONIS in *Chronico Pontif. MS. ap. JAC. ECHARDUM Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 88.—PERCINI *Historia Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*, subjoined to his *Historia Conventus FF Prædicator. Tolosæ* 1693, in 8vo.—*Histoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 394, 395.

shop

shop of *Tournay*, who was the pope's legate in *France*, CENT.
XIII. began to execute this new resolution by appointing *PIERRE CELLAN*, and *GUILLAUME ARNAUD*, *inquisitors of heretical pravity at Tholouse*, and afterwards proceeded in every city, where the Dominicans had a convent, to constitute officers of the same nature, chosen from among the monks of that celebrated order [f]. From this period we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the *inquisition*, which in this and the following ages subdued such a prodigious multitude of heretics, part of whom were converted to the church by terror, and the rest committed to the flames without mercy. For the Dominicans erected, first at *Tholouse*, and afterwards at *Carcassone* and other places, a tremendous court, before which were summoned not only heretics, and persons suspected of heresy, but likewise all who were accused of *magic, sorcery, judaism, witchcraft*, and other crimes of that kind. This tribunal, in process of time, was erected in the other countries of *Europe*, though not every where with the same success [g].

V. The

[f] ECHARD & PERCINUS *loc. citat.*

[g] The accounts we have here given of the first rise of the *Inquisition*, though founded upon the most unexceptionable testimonies and the most authentic records, are yet very different from those that are to be found in most authors. Certain learned men tell us, that the *Tribunal of the Inquisition* was the invention of St. DOMINIC, and was first erected by him in the city of *Tholouse*: that he, of consequence, was the first inquisitor: that the year of its institution is indeed uncertain; but that it was, undoubtedly, confirmed in a solemn manner, by INNOCENT III. in the council of the Lateran in the year 1215. See JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriente*, p. 569.—PHIL. LIMBORCHI *Historia Inquisit.* lib. i. c. x. p. 39. and the other writers mentioned by FABRICIUS. I will not affirm, that the writers, who give this account of the matter, have advanced all this without authority; but this I will venture to say, that the authors, whom they have taken for their guides, are not of the first rate in point of merit and credibility. LIMBORCH, whose *History of the Inquisition*, is looked upon as a most important and capital work, is generally followed by modern writers in their accounts of that odious tribunal. But, however laudable that historian may have been in point of fidelity and diligence, it is certain that he was but little acquainted with the ecclesiastical

V. The method of proceeding in this court of inquisition was at first simple, and almost in every respect, similar to that, which was observed in the ordinary courts of justice [b]. But this simplicity was gradually changed by the Dominicans, to whom experience suggested several new methods of augmenting the pomp and majesty of their spiritual tribunal, and who made such alterations in the forms of proceeding, that the manner of taking cognizance of *heretical* causes became totally different from that which was usual in civil affairs. These friars were, to say the truth, entirely ignorant of judicial matters; nor were they acquainted

tical history of the middle age; that he drew his materials, not from the true and original sources, but from writers of a second class, and thus has fallen, in the course of his history, into various mistakes. His account of the origin of the inquisition is undoubtedly false; nor does that which is given by many other writers approach nearer to the truth. The circumstances of this account, which I have mentioned in the beginning of this note, are more especially destitute of the smallest foundation. Many of the Dominicans, who, in our times, have presided in the court of inquisition, and have extolled the sapientia of that *pious* institution, deny, at the same time, that DOMINIC was its founder, as also that he was the first inquisitor, nay, that he was an inquisitor at all. They go still farther, and affirm, that the court of inquisition was not erected during the life of St. DOMINIC. Nor is all this advanced inconsiderately, as every impartial inquirer into the proofs they alledged will easily perceive. Nevertheless, the question, Whether or not St. DOMINIC was an inquisitor, seems to be merely a dispute about words, and depends entirely upon the different significations of which the term *inquisitor* is susceptible. That word, according to its original meaning, signified a person invested with the commission and authority of the Roman pontiff to extirpate heresy, and oppose its abettors, but not clothed with any judicial power. But it soon acquired a different meaning, and signified a person appointed by the Roman pontiff to proceed *judicially* against heretics and such as were suspected of heresy, to pronounce sentence according to their respective cases, and to deliver over to the secular arm such as persisted obstinately in their errors. In this latter sense DOMINIC was not an *inquisitor*; since it is well known that there were no papal judges of this nature before the pontificate of GREGORY IX; but he was undoubtedly an *inquisitor* in the original sense that was attached to that term.

[b] The records, published by the Benedictines in their *Histoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 371. shew the simplicity that reigned in the proceedings of the inquisition at its first institution.

with

with the procedures of any other tribunal, than that ^{CENT.} which was called, in the Roman church, the *Tribunal* ^{XIII.} *of penance*. It was therefore after this, that they modelled the new court of *Inquisition*, as far as a resemblance between the two was possible; and hence arose that strange system of *Inquisitorial* law, which, in many respects, is so contrary to the common feelings of humanity, and the plainest dictates of equity and justice. This is the important circumstance by which we are enabled to account for the absurd, imprudent, and iniquitous proceedings of the inquisitors against persons, that are accused of holding, what they call, heretical opinions.

VI. That nothing might be wanting to render this spiritual court formidable and tremendous, the Roman pontiffs persuaded the European princes, and more especially the emperor FREDERIC II and LEWIS IX king of *France*, not only to enact the most barbarous laws against *heretics*, and to commit to the flames, by the ministry of public justice, those who were pronounced *such* by the *inquisitors*, but also to maintain the inquisitors in their office, and grant them their protection in the most open and solemn manner. The edicts to this purpose issued out by FREDERIC II are well known; edicts every way proper to excite horror, and which rendered the most illustrious piety and virtue incapable of saving from the cruellest death such as had the misfortune to be disagreeable to the *inquisitors* [i]. These abomi-

The rights
and privi-
leges grant-
ed to the in-
quisition.

[i] The law of the emperor FREDERIC, in relation to the inquisitors, may be seen in LIMBORCH's *History of the Inquisition*, as also in the *Epistles* of PIERRE DE VIGNES, and in BZOVIVS RAYNALDUS, &c. The edict of St. LEWIS, in favour of these ghostly judges, is generally known under the title of *Cupientes*; for so it is called by the French lawyers on account of its beginning with that word. It was issued out in the year 1229, as the Benedictine monks have proved sufficiently in their *Hist. Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 378. 575. It is also published by CATELIUS, in his *Histor. Comit. Tolosanor.* p. 340. and in many other authors. The edict is as severe and inhuman, to the full, as the laws of FREDERIC II. For a great part of the *sanctity* of good king LEWIS consisted in his furious and implacable aversion to *heretics*,
against

CENT.
XIII.

abominable laws were not, however, sufficient to restrain the just indignation of the people against these inhuman judges, whose barbarity was accompanied with superstition and arrogance, with a spirit of suspicion and perfidy, nay, even with temerity and imprudence. Accordingly they were insulted by the multitude in many places, were driven, in an ignominious manner, out of some cities, and were put to death in others; and CONRAD of *Marpurg*, the first German inquisitor, who derived his commission from GREGORY IX, was one of the many victims that were sacrificed upon this occasion to the vengeance of the public [k], which his incredible barbarities had raised to a dreadful degree of vehemence and fury [l].

Severer methods are employed against the heretics.

VII. When INNOCENT III perceived that the labours of the first *inquisitors* were not immediately attended with such abundant fruits as he had fondly expected, he addressed himself, in the year 1207, to PHILIP AUGUSTUS, king of *France*, and to the leading men of that nation, soliciting them by the alluring promise of the most ample *indulgences*, to extirpate all, whom he thought proper to call, heretics, by fire and sword [m]. This exhortation was repeated with new accessions of fervor and earnestness the year following, when PIERRE DE CASTELNAU, the legate of this pontiff, and his inquisitor in *France*, was put to death by the patrons of

against whom he judged it more expedient to employ the influence of racks and gibbets, than the power of reason and argument. See DU FRESNE *Vita Ludovici a Joinvillio scripta*, p. 11. 39.

[k] The life of this furious and celebrated inquisitor has been composed from the most authentic records that are extant, and also from several valuable manuscripts by the learned JOHN HERMAN SCHMINKEUS. See also WADDING. *Annal Minor.* tom. ii. p. 151. 355. & ECHARD. *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i. p. 487.

[(l)] The Abbé FLEURY acknowledges the brutal barbarity of this unrelenting inquisitor, who, under the pretext of heresy, not only committed to the flames a prodigious number of nobles, clerks, monks, hermits, and lay-persons of all ranks, but moreover caused them to be put to death, the very same day they were accused, without appeal. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.* livr. lxxx. §. 24.]

[m] INNOCENT III, *Epistolæ*, Lib. x. *Epist.* 49.

the

the people, called heretics [n]. Not long after this, the Cistercian monks, in the name of this pope, proclaimed a crusade against the heretics throughout the whole kingdom of *France*, and a storm seemed to be gathering against them on all sides: RAYMOND VI, earl of *Toulouse*, in whose territories CASTELNAU had been massacred, was solemnly excommunicated, and, to deliver himself from this ecclesiastical malediction, changed sides, and embarked in the crusade now mentioned. In the year 1209, a formidable army of cross-bearers commenced against the heretics, who were comprehended under the general denomination of *Albigenses* [o], an open war which they carried on with the utmost exertions of cruelty, though with various success, for several years. The chief director of this ghostly war was ARNALD, abbot of the Cistercians, and legate of the Roman pontiff: and the commander in chief of the troops

CENT.
XIII.

[n] Id. ibid. *Lib. xi. Ep. 26, 27, 28, 29.*—*Acta Sanctor. Mart.* tom. i. p. 411.

[o] The term *Albigenses* is used in two senses, of which one is general, and the other more confined. In its more general and extensive sense it comprehends all the various kinds of heretics who resided at this time in *Narbonne Gaul*, i. e. in the southern parts of *France*. This appears from the following passage of PETRUS SARNENSIS, who, in the *Dedication of his History of the Albigenses to Innocent III*, expresses himself thus: *Tolosani et aliarum civitatum, et castrorum hæretici, et defensores eorum generaliter Albigenses vocantur.* The same author divides afterwards the *Albigenses* into various sects (*Cap. ii. p. 3. & 8.*) of which he considers that of the *Waldenses* as the least pernicious. *Mali erant Waldenses, sed comparatione aliorum hæreticorum longe minus perversi.* It was not, however, from the city of *Albigia* or *Albi*, that the French heretics were comprehended under the general title of *Albigenses*, but from another circumstance, to wit, that the greatest part of *Narbonne Gaul* was, in this century, called *Albigesum*, as the Benedictine monks have clearly demonstrated in their *Histoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. not. xiii. p. 552. The term *Albigenses*, in its more confined sense, was used to denote those heretics who inclined towards the Manichæan system, and who were otherwise known by the denominations of *Catharists*, *Publicans*, or *Paulicians*, and *Bulgarians*. This appears evidently from many incontestible authorities, and, more especially from the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*, published by LIMBORCH, in his *History of the Inquisition*, and in which the *Albigenses* are carefully distinguished from the other sects that made a noise in this century.

employed

CENT.
XIII.

employed in this *noble* expedition was SIMON earl of *Montfort*. RAYMOND VI, earl of *Tbolouse*, who, consulting his safety rather than his conscience, had engaged in the crusade against the heretics, was obliged to change sides, and to attack their persecutors. For SIMON, who had embarked in this war not so much from a principle of zeal for religion, or of aversion to the heretics, as from a desire of augmenting his fortune, cast a greedy eye upon the territories of RAYMOND, and his selfish views were seconded and accomplished by the court of *Rome*. After many battles, sieges, and a multitude of other exploits conducted with the most intrepid courage and the most abominable barbarity, he received from the hands of INNOCENT III, at the council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, the county of *Tbolouse*, and the other lands belonging to that earl, as a reward for his zeal in supporting the *cause of God* and of *the church*. About three years after this, he lost his life at the siege of *Tbolouse*, and was followed by RAYMOND, his valiant adversary in the year 1222.

The fruitless
opposition
made by the
earl of *Tbo-
louse* to the
Roman pon-
tiff.

VIII. Thus were the two chiefs of this deplorable war taken off the scene; but this removal was far from extinguishing the infernal flame of persecution on the side of the pontiffs, or calming the restless spirit of faction on that of the pretended heretics. RAYMOND VII, earl of *Tbolouse*, and AMALRIC, earl of *Montfort*, succeeded their fathers at the head of the contending parties, and carried on the war with the utmost vehemence, and with such various success as rendered the issue for some time doubtful. The former seemed at first more powerful than his adversary, and the Roman pontiff HONORIUS III, alarmed at the vigorous opposition he made to the orthodox legions, engaged LEWIS VIII, king of *France*, by the most pompous promises, to march in person with a formidable army against the enemies of the church. The obsequious monarch listened to the solicitations of the lordly pontiff, and embarked with a considerable military force in the cause of the church, but did not live to reap the fruits of his zeal. His en-

gage-

gagements, however, with the court of *Rome*, and his furious designs against the heretics, were executed with the greatest alacrity and vigour by his son and successor LEWIS the *Saint*; so that RAYMOND, pressed on all sides, was obliged, in the year 1229, to make peace upon the most disadvantageous terms, even by making a cession of the greatest part of his territories to the *French* monarch, after having sacrificed a considerable portion of them, as a peace-offering to the church of *Rome* [p]. This treaty of peace gave a mortal blow to the cause of heresy, and dispersed the champions that had appeared in its defence; the *inquisition* was established at *Tholouse*, and the heretics were not only exposed to the pious cruelties of LEWIS, but, what was still more shocking, RAYMOND himself, who had formerly been their patron, became their persecutor, and treated them, upon all occasions, with the most inhuman severity. It is true, this prince broke the engagements into which he had entered by the treaty above-mentioned, and renewed the war against LEWIS and the inquisitors, who abused their victory and the power they had acquired in the most odious manner. But this new effort, in favour of the heretics, was attended with little or no effect; and the unfortunate earl of *Tholouse*, the last representative of that noble and powerful house, dejected and exhausted by the losses he had sustained, and the perplexities in which he was involved, died, in the year 1249, without male issue. And thus ended a

[p] It was in consequence of this treaty (of which the articles were drawn up at *Meaux*, and afterwards confirmed at *Paris* in presence of LEWIS) that the university of *Tholouse* was founded, RAYMOND having bound himself thereby to pay the sum of 4000 silver marks, in order to the support of two professors of divinity, two of canon law, two of grammar, and six of the liberal arts, during the space of ten years. We must also observe, that, what Dr. MOSHEIM says of the cession that RAYMOND made of his lands, is not sufficiently clear and accurate. These lands were not to be transferred till after his death, and they were to be transferred to the brother of LEWIS IX, who, according to the treaty, was to espouse the daughter of RAYMOND. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.* livr. lxxix. § 50.]

C E N T.
XIII.The Bre-
thren and
Sisters of the
free spirit.

civil war, of which religion had been partly the cause and partly the pretext, and which, in its consequences, was highly profitable both to the kings of *France* and to the Roman pontiffs [9].

IX. The severity which the court of *Rome* employed in the extirpation of heresy, and the formidable arguments of fire and sword, racks and gibbets, with which the popes and their creatures reasoned against the enemies of the church, were not sufficient to prevent the rise of new and most pernicious sects in several places. Many of these sects were inconsiderable in themselves, and transitory in their duration, while some of them made a noise in the world, and were suppressed with difficulty. Among the latter we may reckon that of the *Brethren and sisters of the free spirit*, which about this time gained ground secretly and imperceptibly in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, and seduced into its bosom multitudes of persons of both sexes, by the striking

[9] Many writers both ancient and modern have related the circumstances of this religious war, that was carried on against the earls of *Tbolouse* and their confederates, and also against the heretics, whose cause they maintained. But none of the historians, whom I have consulted on this subject, have treated it with that impartiality which is so essential to the merit of historical writing. The Protestant writers, among whom *BASNAGE* deserves an eminent rank, are too favorable to *RAYMOND* and the *Albigenses*; the Roman-catholic historians lean with still more partiality to the other side. Of these latter the most recent are *BENEDICT*, a Dominican monk, author of the *Histoire des Albigeois, des Vaudois et des Barbets*, published at *Paris*, in 1691, in two volumes 12mo. — *J. BAPT. LANGLOIS*, a jesuit, who composed the *Histoire des Croisades contre les Albigeois*, which was published in 12mo. at *Rouen*, in 1703, to which we must add *Jo. JAC. PERCINI Monumenta Conventus Tolosani Ordinis FF Prædicator. in quibus Historia hujus Conventus distribuitur et refertur totius Albigensium facti narratio, Tolosæ, 1693 Fol.* These writers are chargeable with the greatest partiality and injustice in the reproaches and calumnies they throw out so liberally against the *RAYMONDS* and the *Albigenses*, while they disguise, with a perfidious dexterity, the barbarity of *SIMON of Montfort*, and the ambitious views of extending their dominions that engaged the kings of *France* to enter into this war. The most ample and accurate account of this expedition against the Heretics is that which is given by the learned Benedictines *CLAUDE LE VIC* and *JOSEPH VAISSETTE*, in their *Histoire Generale de Languedoc, Paris 1730. tom. iii.* in which, however, there are several omissions which render that valuable work defective.

appear-

appearance of piety that was observed in the conduct of the members that composed it. How far the councils of this century proceeded against this new sect, we cannot say with any certainty; because we have upon record but a few of the decrees that were issued out upon that occasion: Perhaps the obscurity of the rising faction screened it, in a great measure, from public view. But this was not the case in the following age; the *Brethren* and *Sisters* above-mentioned came forth from their retreats in proportion as their numbers increased; they drew upon them the eyes of the world, and particularly those of the *inquisitors*, who committed to the flames such of these unhappy enthusiasts as fell into their hands; while the councils, held in *Germany* and other nations, loaded them with excommunications and damnatory edicts.

This new sect took their denomination from the words of St. PAUL [r], and maintained that the true children of God were invested with the privilege of a full and perfect *freedom* from the jurisdiction of the *law* [s]. They were called, by the Germans and Flemish, *Beghards* and *Beguttes*, which, as we have seen already, was a name usually given to those who made an extraordinary profession of piety and devotion. They received from others the reproachful denomination of

[r] *Romans* viii. 2, 14.

[s] The accounts we here give of these wretched Fanatics are, for the most part, taken from authentic records, which have not been as yet published, from the decrees of synods and councils held in *France* and *Germany*, from the *Diploma's* of the Roman pontiffs, the sentences pronounced by the *inquisitors*, and the other sources of information to which I have had access. I have also a collection of extracts from certain books of these enthusiasts, and more especially from that which treated of the *Nine spiritual rocks*, and which was in the highest esteem among the *free brethren*, who considered it as a treasure of divine wisdom and doctrine. As I cannot expose here these records to the examination of the curious reader, I beg leave to refer him to a long and ample edict issued out against these *Brethren* by HENRY I, archbishop of *Cologne*, and published in the *Statuta Colonienfis*, A. 1554. p. 58. This edict is, in every respect, conformable to those published, on the same occasion, at *Mentz*, *Aschaffenburg*, *Paderborn*, *Beziere*, *Triers*, and other places.

CENT.
XIII.

Bicorni, i. e. Ideots. In France they were known by the appellation of *Beghins* and *Beghines*, while the multitude distinguished them by that of *Turlupins*, the origin and reason of which title I have not been able to learn [t]. Nothing carried a more shocking air of lunacy and distraction than their external aspect and manners. They ran from place to place cloathed in the most singular and fantastic apparel, and begged their bread with wild shouts and clamours, rejecting with horror every kind of industry and labour, as an obstacle to divine contemplation, and to the ascent of the soul towards the father of spirits. In all their excursions they were followed by women, with whom they lived in the most intimate familiarity [u]. They distributed among the people books, which contained the substance of their doctrine, held nocturnal assemblies in places remote from public view, and seduced many from frequenting the ordinary institutions of divine worship.

X. These *brethren*, who gloried in the freedom which they pretended to have obtained, *through the spirit*, from the dominion and obligation of the law, adopted a certain rigid and fantastic system of *Mystic theology*, built upon pretended philosophical principles, which carried a striking resemblance of the impious doctrines of the *Pantheists*. For they held, "That things followed by emanation from God, and were finally to return to their divine source: that rational souls were so many portions of the supreme Deity, and that the universe, considered as one great whole, was God: that every

[t] Many have written, but none with accuracy and precision, concerning the *Turlupins*. See BEAUSOBRE'S *Dissertation sur les Adamites*, part II. p. 384. where that learned author has fallen into several errors, as usually happens to him when he treats of subjects of this kind. I know not the origin of the word *Turlupin*, but I am able to demonstrate by the most authentic records, that the persons so called, who were burnt at Paris and in other parts of France, were no other than the *Brethren of the free spirit*, who were condemned by the Roman pontiffs, and also by various councils.

[u] Hence they were called, in Germany, *Schwesstriones*, as appear by the decrees of several councils.

"man

“ man by the power of contemplation, and by calling
 “ off his mind from sensible and terrestrial objects,
 “ might be united to the Deity in an ineffable manner,
 “ and become one with the source and parent of all
 “ things: and that they, who, by long and assiduous
 “ meditation, had plunged themselves, as it were, into
 “ the *abyss* of the divinity, acquired thereby a most
 “ glorious and sublime liberty, and were not only de-
 “ livered from the violence of sinful lusts, but even
 “ from the common instincts of nature.” From these
 and such like doctrines the *brethren*, under considera-
 tion, drew this impious and horrid conclusion, “ That
 “ the person who had ascended to God in this manner,
 “ and was absorbed by contemplation in the abyss of
 “ Deity, became thus a part of godhead, commenced
 “ God, was the *Son of God* in the same sense and man-
 “ ner that *CHRIST* was, and was thereby raised to a
 “ glorious independance, and freed from the obligation
 “ of all laws human and divine.” It was in consequence
 of all this, they treated with contempt the ordinances
 of the gospel, and every external act of religious wor-
 ship, looking upon prayer, fasting, baptism, and the sa-
 crament of the Lord’s supper, as the first elements of
 piety adapted to the state and capacity of children, and as
 of no sort of use to the *perfect man*, whom long medi-
 tation had raised above all external things, and carried
 into the bosom and essence of the Deity [w].

XI. A-

[w] It may not be improper to place here a certain number of sen-
 tences translated faithfully from several of the more secret books of
 these Heretics. The following will be sufficient to give the curious
 reader a full idea of their impiety:

*Every pious and good man is the only begotten son of God, whom God en-
 gendered from all eternity: (for these Heretics maintained, that what the
 scriptures taught concerning the distinction of Three Persons in the divine
 nature, is by no means to be understood literally, and therefore ex-
 plained it according to the principles of their mystical and fantastical
 system.)*

*All created things are non-entities or nothing: I do not say that they are
 small and minute; but that they are absolutely nothing.*

*There is in the soul of man something that is neither created, nor suscepti-
 ble of creation, and that is, rationality, or the power of reasoning.*

CENT.

XIII.

Among these heretics there were some that distinguished themselves by their eminent probity, and others that were licentious in an infamous degree.

XI. Among these Fanatics there were several persons of eminent probity, who had entered into this sect with the most upright intentions, and who extended that *liberty of the spirit*, which they looked upon as the privilege of true believers, no farther than to an exemption from the duties of external worship, and an immunity from the positive laws of the church. The whole of religion was placed by this class of men in internal devotion, and they treated with the utmost contempt the rules of monastic discipline, and all other external rites and institutions, as infinitely beneath the attention of the *perfect*. Nor were their exhortations and their examples without effect; for about the middle of this century they persuaded a considerable number of monks and devout persons, in *Swabia*, to *live without any rule, and to serve God in the liberty of the spirit, which was the most acceptable service that could be presented to the Deity* [x]. The inquisitors, however, stopped these poor enthusiasts in the midst of their career, and committed several of them to the flames, in which they expired, not only with the most unclouded serenity, but

God is neither good, nor better, nor best: whosoever therefore calls the Deity good, does as foolishly as he who calls an object black, which he knows to be white.

God still engenders his only-begotten son, begets still the same son, whom he had begotten from eternity. For every operation of the Deity is uniform and one; and therefore he engenders his son without any division.

What the scriptures say concerning Christ is true of every divine man. And every quality of the divine nature belongs equally to every person, whose piety is genuine and sincere.

To these horrid passages we may add the following sentences, in which JOHN, bishop of *Strasbourg* (in an edict he published against the *Brethren of the free spirit* or *Beghards*, in the year 1317, the Sunday before the feast of the assumption of the Virgin Mary) discovers farther the blasphemous doctrines of this impious sect. *Deus* (say these Heretics) *est formaliter omne quod est. Quilibet homo perfectus est Christus per naturam. Homo perfectus est liber in totum, nec tenetur ad servandum præcepta ecclesiæ data à Deo. Multa sunt poetica in evangelio, quæ non sunt vera, et homines credere magis debent conceptibus ex anima sua Deo juncta profectis, quam evangelio, &c.*

[x] See MARR. CRUSIUS *Annal. Suevicorum*, part. III. lib. ii. cap. xiv. ad A. 1261. p. 99 edit. *Vet.*—This author has taken his materials from *Felix Faber*, an impartial writer.

even

even with the most triumphant feelings of chearfulness and joy. CENT.
XIII.

But there were among these *Brethren of the free spirit* another class of Fanatics very different from these mentioned, and much more extravagant, whose system of religion was as dangerous, as it was ridiculous and absurd, since it opened a door to the most licentious manners. These wretched enthusiasts maintained, that, by continual contemplation, it was possible to eradicate all the instincts of nature out of the *heaven-born* mind, and to introduce into the soul a certain divine stupor, and holy apathy, which they looked upon as the great characteristics of Christian perfection. The persons, who adopted these sentiments, took strange liberties in consequence of their pretended sanctity, and shewed, indeed, by their conduct that they had little regard to external appearances; for they held their secret assemblies stark naked, and lay in the same beds with their spiritual sisters, or, indiscriminately, with other women, without the smallest scruple or hesitation. This shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system. They looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption, as the characters of a soul that was still under the dominion of the sensual, animal, and lascivious spirit, and that was not, as yet, re-united to the divine nature, its center and source. And they considered, as at a fatal distance from the Deity, all such as either felt the carnal suggestions of nature, or were penetrated with warm emotions at the view or approach of persons of a different sex, or were incapable of vanquishing and suppressing the rising fervor of lust and intemperance [y]. There

[y] Certain writers, whose principal zeal is employed in the defence of these heretics, and who have accustomed themselves to entertain a high idea of the sanctity of all those, who, in the middle age separated themselves from the communion of the church of *Rome*, suspect the inquisitors of having attributed falsely these impious doctrines to the *Brethren of the free spirit*, with a view to blacken these pious men, and to render them odious. But this suspicion is entirely groundless; and the account of this matter, which we have given in the text, is conformable to the strictest truth. The inquisitors have been less fa-

CENT.

XIII.

There were moreover, in this fanatical troop, certain enthusiasts, who far surpassed in impiety the two classes we have been now mentioning, who abused the system and doctrines of the sect, so as to draw from them an apology for all kinds of wickedness, and who audaciously maintained that the *divine man*, or the believer, who was intimately united to God, *could not sin*, let his conduct be ever so horrible and atrocious. This execrable doctrine was not, indeed, explained in the same manner by all the *Brethren of the free spirit* that were so outrageous as to adopt it. Some held, that the motions and actions of the body had no relation at all to the soul, which, by its union with God, was blended with the divine nature: others fell into a notion infinitely injurious to the supreme Being, and maintained, that the propensities and passions, that arose in the soul of the *divine man* after his union with the Deity, were the propensities and affections of God himself, and were therefore, notwithstanding their apparent deformity and opposition to the law, holy and good, seeing that the supreme Being is infinitely exalted above all law, and all obligation [z]. It is necessary to

bulous in their accusations of these heretics, than many are apt to imagine. They acknowledge that the *Beghards*, though destitute of shame, were not chargeable, generally speaking, with a breach of the duties of chastity and abstinence. They were indeed of opinion, that this firmness and insensibility of heart, which rendered them proof against female charms and deaf to the voice of nature, was a privilege granted them by the devil. For they adopted the opinion of honest NIEDER, (*Formicar. lib. iii. cap. v. p. 346.*) and affirmed, that it was in the power of that evil spirit to render men cold, and to extinguish the warm and lascivious solicitations of nature; and that Satan wrought this miracle upon his friends and adherents in order to procure them a high reputation of sanctity, and make them appear superior in virtue to the rest of mankind. *Credo* (saith NIEDER, who was both a Dominican and an inquisitor) *quosdam ex eis demonis opere affectos fuisse, ne moveretur ad naturales actus incontinentiæ . . . Facillimum enim est demonibus infrigidare.*

[z] This account will be confirmed by the following passage faithfully translated from the famous book of the *Nine Rocks*, written originally in German: *Moreover the divine man operates and engenders whatever the Deity operates and engenders. For in God he produced and formed the heavens and the earth. He is also the father of the eternal word.* Neither

to observe, before we leave this subject, that flagitious and impious impostors mingled themselves sometimes with this sect, and took the name of *Beghards*, that by a feigned piety they might impose upon the multitude, and deceive the simple into their snares [a].

C B N T.
XIII.

XII. The

Neither could God produce any thing without this divine man, who is therefore obliged to render his will conformable to the will of God, that so whatsoever may be agreeable to the Deity, may be agreeable to him also. If therefore it be the will of God that I should commit sin, my will must be the same, and I must not even desire to abstain from sin. This is true contrition. And although a man, who is well and truly united to God, may have committed a thousand mortal sins, he ought not even to wish that he had not committed them; nay, he should rather die a thousand deaths than omit one of these mortal sins. Hence the accusation brought by the inquisitors against this impious sect, whom they reproach with maintaining, that the sin of a man united to God, is not sin, since God works in him and with him whatever he does. HENRY SUSO, a Dominican monk, and one of the most celebrated Mystic writers, composed, in the following century, another Book concerning the Nine Rocks, which is to be found in the edition of his works published by LAURENT. SURRIUS. But this book is entirely different from that, which was in such high esteem among the *Beghards*, though it bears the same title. The latter is of much older date, and was in vogue in Germany, among the Brethren of the free spirit, long before SUSO was born. There fell some time ago into my hands an ancient manuscript, composed in Alsace during the xvth century, and containing an account of various Revelations and Visions of that age. In this manuscript I found a piece entitled, *Declaratio Religiosi cujusdam super revelatione Carthusiano cuidam de Ecclesie per gladium reformatione, Leodii. A. 1453, facia*; and almost in the beginning of this declaration the following passage relating to the Book of the Nine Rocks: *Homo quidam devotissimus, licet Laicus, Librum de novem Rubibus conscripsit à Deo impulsus, ubi multa ad præsens pertinentia continentur de Ecclesie renovatione et prævia gravi persecutione.* These Nine Rocks signified, according to the fanatical doctrine of this wrong-headed sect, the different steps by which the divine man ascended to the Deity.

[a] The founder of this famous sect, the place of its origin, and the precise date of its first appearance are not known with any degree of certainty. I have actually in my possession *Eighty nine Sentences of the Beghards, vulgarly called Schwesstromes, but who style themselves Brethren of the sect of the Free Spirit and of voluntary Poverty, with a Refutation of the said Sentences, written at Worms towards the conclusion of this century by some one or other of the inquisitors.* The 79th of these sentences runs thus: *To say that the truth is in Rhetia, is to fall into the heresy of Donatus, who said, that God was in Africa, and not elsewhere.* From these words it appears evident, that Rhetia was the place, where the church of the Brethren of the free spirit was fixed and established, and

that

CENT.

XIII.

Ama'ric.

XII. The famous AMALRIC, native of BENE, and professor of logic and theology at *Paris*, whose bones were dug up and publicly burnt in the year 1209, although he had abjured his errors before his death, and a considerable number of whose disciples and followers were committed to the flames on account of their absurd and pernicious doctrine, was, undoubtedly, of the same way of thinking with the sect whose opinions we have been now considering [b]. For though the writers of this barbarous age have given very different and confused accounts of this man's opinions, and even attributed some doctrines to him which he never maintained, it is, nevertheless, certain, that he taught, that all things were the parts of one substance, or, in other words, that the universe was God, and that not only the *forms* of all things, but also their *matter* or substance proceeded from the Deity, and must return to the source from whence they were derived [c]. From these absurd and

that from this province they passed into *Germany*. I am not however of opinion, that this sect had its first rise in that province; but am rather inclined to think that *Italy* was its country, and that, being driven from thence, it took refuge in *Rhetia*. Nor is it at all improbable, that *Italy*, which saw so many religious factions arise in its bosom, was also the nursing mother of this blasphemous sect. We shall be almost fully confirmed in this opinion when we consider that, in a long letter from CLEMENT V to RAINIER bishop of *Cremona* (published by ODOR. RAYNALDUS *Annal.* tom. xv. A. 1311, n. 66. p. 90.) the zealous pontiff exhorts that prelate to suppress and extirpate, with all his might, the sect of the Brethren of the free spirit, which was settled in several parts of *Italy*, and particularly in the province of *Spoletto* and the countries adjacent. Such are the terms of the pontiff's letter; in nonnullis *Italiae* partibus, tam *Spoletanæ* provinciæ, quam circumjacentium regionum.

[b] This did not escape the notice of the enemies of the *Beghards*, or *Brethren of the free spirit*, in *Germany*, much less that of the *Inquisitors*, who, in their *Refutation of the 89 Sentences of the Beghards* mentioned in the preceding Note, express themselves thus: (*Sententiâ* 68.) *Dicere quod omnis creatura est Deus, hæresis Alexandri * est, qui dixit, materiam primam et Deum et Hominem, hoc est mentes, esse in substantia, quod postea quidam David de Dinanto sequutus est, qui temporibus nostris de hac hæresi de Francia fugatus est, et punitus fuisset, si deprehensus fuisset.*

[(f) The account given by FLEURY, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, of the opinions of AMALRIC, is very different from that which is here

* The person here mentioned is ALEXANDER, the Epicurean, of whom PLUTARCH speaks in his *Symposium*.

and blasphemous principles he deduced that chimerical system of fanatical devotion, which we have already exposed to the view of the reader, pretended to demonstrate the possibility of incorporating or translating the human nature into the divine, and rejected all kinds of external worship, as insignificant and useless. The disciples of this enthusiast were men of exemplary piety, were distinguished by the gravity and austerity of their lives and manners, and suffered death in the most dreadful forms with the utmost resolution and constancy. One of the most eminent among these was DAVID of *Dinant*, a Parisian doctor, who usually expressed the fundamental principle of his master in the following proposition: *God is the primary matter or substance of all things.* He composed a work entitled, *Quaternarii*, with several other productions, which were chiefly designed to affect and gain the multitude: but, after all, was obliged to save himself by flight [d]. The bishops

CENT.
XIII.

given by Dr. MOSHEIM. The former observes, that AMALRIC, or AMAURI, taught that every Christian was obliged to believe himself a member of Jesus Christ, and that without this belief none could be saved, and he observes also that his disciples introduced errors still more pernicious, such as the following: "That the power of the Father had continued only during the Mosaic dispensation, that of the Son 1200 years after his entrance upon earth, and that, in the XIIIth century, the age of the Holy Spirit commenced, in which the sacraments and all external worship were to be abolished; that there would be no resurrection; that heaven and hell were mere fictions," and many more sentiments of that nature which, as the learned SPANHEIM * imagines, were falsely imputed to AMALRIC, in order to render his memory odious, because he had opposed the worship of saints and images. See FLEURY, *Hist. Ecclesias*, livr. lxxvi. § 59.—Dr. MOSHEIM looks upon AMALRIC to have been a Pantheist, and many men of eminent learning are of this opinion. See among others JOH. GERSON apud JAC. THOMASII, as also BRUCKER's *Hist. Philosoph.* tom. iii. p. 688.]

[d] See MARTENZ, *Thesaur. Anecdotor.* tom. iv. p. 163. where there is an account of the heresies for which several priests were burnt at Paris in the year 1209—NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Hist. Eccl. Sæc.* xiii. cap. iii. art. ii. p. 76.—DU BOIS, *Historia Eccles. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 244.—BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 24. 48. 53.—JAC. THOMASII, *De Exultatione Mundi Stoica*, p. 199.

* See SPANHEMII *Hist. Eccles. Sæc.* xxii. p. 1694.

CENT.
XIII.

assembled in council at *Paris* in the year 1209, considered the philosophy of ARISTOTLE as the source of all these impious doctrines, and, on that account, prohibited the reading, or explaining, either in public or private, the metaphysical, and other productions of the Grecian sage [e].

Joachim.
Wilhelmina.

XIII. If we may depend upon the accounts given by certain writers, AMALRIC and his followers received with the utmost docility and faith the predictions, attributed to JOACHIM abbot of *Flora*, concerning the reformation that was soon to be brought about in the church by the power of the sword, the approaching *Age of the holy Ghost* that was to succeed those of the Father and the Son, and other things of that nature, which raised the hopes, and occupied the thoughts of the *Spiritual* Franciscans. Whether these accounts may be depended upon or not we shall not determine. To us they appear extremely doubtful. It is, however, true, that certain persons were so far deluded by these pretended prophecies, as to form new sects with a view to their accomplishment, and to declare war against the established church, its system of doctrine, and its forms of worship. Among other fanatical sectaries, there arose one of a most extraordinary kind, a Bohemian woman named *Wilhelmina*, who resided in the territory of *Milan*. This delirious and wrong-headed woman having studied with attention the predictions concerning the *Age of the holy Ghost*, was extravagant enough to persuade herself, and, what is still more amazing, had influence enough to persuade others, that the holy Ghost was become *incarnate* in her person for the salvation of a great part of mankind. According to her doctrine, "None were saved by the blood of JESUS, but true and pious Christians; while the Jews, Saracens, and unworthy Christians were to obtain salvation through the holy spirit which dwelt in her, and that, in consequence thereof, all that had happened to CHRIST, during his appearance upon earth in the human nature, was to be exactly renewed

[e] LAUNOIUS, *De varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Paris.* p. 127.

" in

“ in her person, or rather in that of the holy Ghost, CENT. XIII. which was united to her.” This mad-woman died at *Milan* in the year 1281, in the most fragrant odour of sanctity, and her memory was not only held in the highest veneration by her numerous followers and the ignorant multitude, but was also honoured with religious worship both in public and in private. Her sect, nevertheless, was discovered by the curious eye of persecution in the year 1300, and fell into the clutches of the inquisitors, who destroyed the magnificent monument that had been erected in her honour, had her bones raised and committed to the flames, and in the same fire consumed the chief leaders of this wretched faction, among which there were persons of both sexes [*f*].

XIV. It was upon predictions similar to those mentioned in the preceding section, that *the sect of the apostles*, founded its discipline. The members of this sect made little or no alterations in the doctrinal part of the public religion; what they principally aimed at, was, to introduce among Christians the simplicity of the primitive times, and more especially the manner of life that was observed by the apostles. The sect called Apostles. GERHARD SAGARELLI, the founder of this sect, obliged his followers to go from place to place as the apostles did, to wander about cloathed in white, with long beards, dishevelled hair, and bare heads, accompanied with women, whom they called their *Sisters*. They were also obliged to renounce all kinds of property and possessions, and to preach in public the necessity of repentance, while in their more private assemblies they declared the approaching destruction of the corrupt church of *Rome*, and the establishment of a purer service, and a more glorious church, that, according to the prophecies of ab-

[*f*] The Milanese historians, such as BERNARD, CORIUS, and others, have related the adventures of this odd woman; but their accounts are very different from those given by the learned MURATORI, in his *Antiqq. Italicæ mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 91. and which he has drawn from the judicial proceedings, of the court, where the extraordinary case of this female fanatic was examined. We are informed by the same excellent author, that a learned writer, named PURCELLI, composed a history of WILHELMINA, and of her sect.

CENT.
XIII.

assembled in council at *Paris* in the year 1209, considered the philosophy of ARISTOTLE as the source of all these impious doctrines, and, on that account, prohibited the reading, or explaining, either in public or private, the metaphysical, and other productions of the Grecian sage [e].

Joachim.
Wilhelmina.

XIII. If we may depend upon the accounts given by certain writers, AMALRIC and his followers received with the utmost docility and faith the predictions, attributed to JOACHIM abbot of *Flora*, concerning the reformation that was soon to be brought about in the church by the power of the sword, the approaching *Age of the holy Ghost* that was to succeed those of the Father and the Son, and other things of that nature, which raised the hopes, and occupied the thoughts of the *Spiritual* Franciscans. Whether these accounts may be depended upon or not we shall not determine. To us they appear extremely doubtful. It is, however, true, that certain persons were so far deluded by these pretended prophecies, as to form new sects with a view to their accomplishment, and to declare war against the established church, its system of doctrine, and its forms of worship. Among other fanatical sectaries, there arose one of a most extraordinary kind, a Bohemian woman named *Wilhelmina*, who resided in the territory of *Milan*. This delirious and wrong-headed woman having studied with attention the predictions concerning the *Age of the holy Ghost*, was extravagant enough to persuade herself, and, what is still more amazing, had influence enough to persuade others, that the holy Ghost was become *incarnate* in her person for the salvation of a great part of mankind. According to her doctrine, "None were saved by the blood of JESUS, but true and pious Christians; while the Jews, Saracens, and unworthy Christians were to obtain salvation through the holy spirit which dwelt in her, and that, in consequence thereof, all that had happened to CHRIST, during his appearance upon earth in the human nature, was to be exactly renewed

[e] LAUNOIUS, *De varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Paris.* p. 127.

" in

“ in her person, or rather in that of the holy Ghost, CENT. XIII. which was united to her.” This mad-woman died at *Milan* in the year 1281, in the most fragrant odour of sanctity, and her memory was not only held in the highest veneration by her numerous followers and the ignorant multitude, but was also honoured with religious worship both in public and in private. Her sect, nevertheless, was discovered by the curious eye of persecution in the year 1300, and fell into the clutches of the inquisitors, who destroyed the magnificent monument that had been erected in her honour, had her bones raised and committed to the flames, and in the same fire consumed the chief leaders of this wretched faction, among which there were persons of both sexes [f].

XIV. It was upon predictions similar to those mentioned in the preceding section, that *the sect of the apostles*, founded its discipline. The members of this sect made little or no alterations in the doctrinal part of the public religion; what they principally aimed at, was, to introduce among Christians the simplicity of the primitive times, and more especially the manner of life that was observed by the apostles. GERHARD SAGARELLI, the founder of this sect, obliged his followers to go from place to place as the apostles did, to wander about cloathed in white, with long beards, dishevelled hair, and bare heads, accompanied with women, whom they called their *Sisters*. They were also obliged to renounce all kinds of property and possessions, and to preach in public the necessity of repentance, while in their more private assemblies they declared the approaching destruction of the corrupt church of *Rome*, and the establishment of a purer service, and a more glorious church, that, according to the prophecies of ab-

The sect called Apostles.

[f] The Milanese historians, such as BERNARD, CORIUS, and others, have related the adventures of this odd woman; but their accounts are very different from those given by the learned MURATORI, in his *Antiqq. Italicae mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 91. and which he has drawn from the judicial proceedings, of the court, where the extraordinary case of this female fanatic was examined. We are informed by the same excellent author, that a learned writer, named PURCELLI, composed a history of WILHELMINA, and of her sect.

bot

CENT.
XIII.

bot JOACHIM, was to arise from its ruins. No sooner was the unhappy leader of this faction committed to the flames [g], than he was succeeded in that character by a bold enterprising Fanatic, named DULCINUS, a native of *Novara*, who published his predictions with more courage and maintained them with more zeal than his predecessor had done, and who did not hesitate to declare that, in a short time, the Roman pontiff BONIFACE VIII, with the corrupt priests and the licentious monks were to perish by the hand of the emperor FREDERIC III, son of PETER, king of *Arragon*, and that a new and most holy pontiff was to be raised to the head of the church. These visionary predictions were, no doubt, drawn from the dreams of the abbot JOACHIM, who is said to have declared, among other things, that an emperor, called FREDERIC III, was to bring to perfection what FREDERIC II had left unfinished. Be that as it may, DULCINUS appeared with intrepid assurance at the head of the apostles, and acting not only in the character of a prophet, but also in that of a general, he assembled an army to maintain his cause, and perhaps to accomplish, at least in part, his predictions. He was opposed by RAYNERIUS, bishop of *Vercelli*, who defended the interests of the Roman pontiff, and carried on during the space of two years and more, a most bloody and dreadful war against this chief of the apostles. The issue of this contest was fatal to the latter, who, after several battles fought with obstinate courage, was at length taken prisoner, and put to death at *Vercelli* in the most barbarous manner in the year 1307, together with *Margaret*, whom he had chosen for his *Spiritual Sister*, according to the custom of his sect. The terrible end of DULCINUS was not immediately followed by the downfall of his sect, which still subsisted in *France*, *Germany*, and in other countries, and stood firm against the most vehement efforts of its enemies until the beginning of the xvth century, when, under the pontificate of BONIFACE IX, it was totally extirpated [h].

XV. This

[g] This unhappy man was burnt alive at *Parma*, in the year 1300.

[h] I composed in the German language an accurate history, in 111 books.

XV. This famous JOACHIM, abbot of *Flora*, whose fanatical predictions turned the heads of so many well-meaning people, and excited them to attempt reforming the church by the sword, and to declare open war against the Roman pontiffs, did not fall under the suspicion of heresy on account of these predictions, but in consequence of a new explication he had given of the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the godhead. He had in an elaborate work attacked very warmly PETER LOMBARD, the master of the sentences, on account of the distinction this latter writer had made between the *divine essence*, and the *three persons* in the godhead; for JOACHIM looked upon this doctrine as introducing a *fourth* object, even an *essence*, into the Trinity. But the good man was too little versed in metaphysical matters, to carry on a controversy of such a subtle nature, and he was betrayed by his ignorance so far as to advance inconsiderately the most rash and exceptionable tenets. For he denied that there was any thing, or any *essence*, that belonged in common to the three persons in the Trinity, or was jointly possessed by them; by which doctrine the *substantial* union between the three persons was taken away, and the unity of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost was reduced from a *natural, simple, and numerical* unity, to a *moral* one only, that is, to such a unity as reigns in the counsels and opinions of different persons, who embrace the same notions, and think and act with one accord. This explication of the Trinity was looked upon by many as very little different from the Arian system, and there-

books, of this famous sect, which is very little known in our times, and I have in my hands materials, that will furnish an interesting addition to that history. That this sect subsisted in *Germany*, and in some other countries, until the pontificate of BONIFACE IX, is evident from the *Chronicle* of HERMAN CORNERUS, published by JO. GEORGE ECCARD, in his *Corpus Historicum medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 906. and may be sufficiently demonstrated by other authentic testimonies. In the year 1402, a certain member of this apostolical sect, whose name was WILLIAM, or WILHELMUS, was burnt alive at *Lubeck*. See CORNERUS *loc. cit.* p. 1185. The Germans, who were accustomed to distinguish by the name of *Beghards* all those who pretended to extraordinary piety, and sought, by poverty and begging, an eminent reputation for sanctity and virtue, gave this title also to the sect of the *Apostles*.

CENT.
XIII.

A true account of the heresy that was imputed to Joachim.

fore

CENT.
XIII.

fore the Roman pontiff, INNOCENT III, pronounced, in the year 1215, in the council of the Lateran a damnable sentence against the doctrine of JOACHIM, which sentence, however, did not extend to the person or fame of the abbot himself. And, indeed, notwithstanding this papal sentence, JOACHIM has at this day a considerable number of adherents and defenders, more especially among those of the Franciscans, who are called *Observants*. Some of these maintain that the book of this abbot was corrupted and interpolated by his enemies, while the rest are of opinion that his doctrine was not thoroughly understood by those that opposed it [i].

[i] See DAN. PAPEBROCHIUS, *Disquis. Histor. de Florensi Ordine, Prophetiis, Doctrina, B. Joachimi*, in *Actis Sanctorum Maii*, tom. vi. p. 486. which contains *The life of Joachim*, and several other pieces of consequence. See also NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Hist. Eccles. Sac.* xiii. Diff. ii. p. 331.—LVC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 6.



THE END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

II.
in
a-
ch
or
d-
n-
f-
l-
k
is
e
d

i.
of
i.

2

